

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 197

SP 037-768

TITLE Policies and Programs for Professional Development of Teachers: Profiles of the States.

INSTITUTION Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Philadelphia, PA.

SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, NY.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 1996-00-00

NOTE 201p.

AVAILABLE FROM Consortium for Policy Research in Education, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3440 Market Street, Suite 560, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3325.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Educational Finance; Educational Policy; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Financial Support; Inservice Teacher Education; Policy Formation; Secondary School Teachers; State Government; State Programs; *State Standards; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

These profiles are a product of a 50-state study of state teacher professional development policies and programs for teachers conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The primary purpose of the work is to provide an information base for state policymakers interested in improving teacher learning opportunities in their states. An accompanying report discusses the state of professional development for teachers and the states' roles in professional development, and it provides information on state initiatives, state requirements, state funding, induction programs, and state incentives as of 1996. Each state profile lists the number of teachers, average years of experience for teachers, percentage of teachers holding Master's degrees, and average teacher salary. Each profile provides information on the following topics: (1) education policy context; (2) the state role in professional development (teacher certification policies, state-supported programs, and federal- or foundation-supported programs); (3) public funding for professional development (state, federal, and local funds); (4) impact of state policies on local professional development; (5) teacher compensation for professional development; (6) other professional development opportunities; (7) contacts/information resources; (8) publications and reports; and (9) ordering information. (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *



ED 416 197

Consortium for Policy
Research in Education

University of
Pennsylvania

Harvard University

Stanford University

University of Michigan

University of Wisconsin-
Madison

Policies and Programs for Professional Development of Teachers:

Profiles of the States

These profiles are a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Consortium for Policy Research in Education
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These profiles are a product of a 50-state study of state professional development policies and programs for teachers conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study, profiles and other publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support was provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking and Management in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

The primary purpose of this work is to provide an information base for state policymakers interested in improving teacher learning opportunities in their states. The profiles may be useful for stimulating discussion about professional development within a state. Policymakers may also find it useful to examine how other states are meeting this critical need.

The State of Professional Development for Teachers

The professional development opportunities available in most school districts in the United States have limited effects on the practice of teaching and on student outcomes. The primary reasons include:

- There is generally no follow-up to in-service activities (with the exception of some induction programs for beginning teachers) to help teachers use new practices in their classrooms.
- The links between in-service content and teachers' needs are weak, as are the links between one in-service activity and the next, between in-service and supervision, and between teachers' work assignments and the courses they take. There is typically poor alignment and coordination throughout the system.
- The quality of professional learning environments is low: they lack intensity, are of short duration, and seldom provide opportunities for observation, practice, and feedback. There are generally no standards for district programs or for offerings of other professional development providers.
- Too little attention is given to teachers' subject-matter knowledge, especially that of elementary teachers which is critical to raising academic standards. If content is addressed, the implications for pedagogy are seldom addressed at the same time.

Current professional development policies are ineffective and expensive. Most districts have no idea what they spend on professional development because funds are fragmented across budget categories. Consequently, we do not have good data on how much is spent. Studies of individual districts indicate that they spend two to four percent of their budgets on professional development. When the present value of future salary increments awarded for educational attainments is included, this amount increases to three to seven percent of their school budgets. Salary increments represent 60 percent of the total amount spent on professional development in some districts. In addition, teachers also spend considerable amounts of their own money to enhance their knowledge and skills.

There are exceptions to this dreary scenario. Some districts have well-designed staff development programs that are focused and provide continuity. There are new partnerships developing between universities and districts that show promise, and there are some promising networks of teachers working together. But these are exceptions to the generally low-demand, fragmented array of workshops and conferences.

The Need for Improved Professional Development

Teaching is becoming a more complex and difficult task at the same time that public expectations about student performance are rising. Teachers are being asked to teach to higher academic standards and to help students attain deeper understanding of content. They are being asked to help all students, not just the academically motivated, reach these standards. Students are more diverse culturally, linguistically, and in their learning styles. Students with special learning needs are being included in regular classrooms, and other kinds of tracking are being reduced. Teachers are being asked to take on new roles and responsibilities within restructured schools involving governance, planning, staff development, mentoring, curriculum development, assessment, and counseling.

The norms of good instructional practice are also changing. Inquiry-based instruction, cooperative learning, interdisciplinary connections, use of technology, and more rigorous and technically adequate assessment are now seen as hallmarks of good teaching. These new norms are being institutionalized through the adoption of standards of practice for initial licensing and board certification.

To meet these challenges, schools must change, and teachers must change. Schools cannot succeed if teachers continue to work alone in the isolation of their classrooms. Schools must become communities of practitioners who work together to improve their practice and to help their students meet high standards. Teachers must become active members of these communities, committed to the search for more effective practices. New norms of cooperative diagnosis, reflection, and improvement must replace the conventions of isolated practice. Knowledge drawn from research and practice must be integrated, codified, and taken more seriously as a basis for improving practice.

To make these changes, teachers must not only improve their content knowledge and their teaching skills, but change the norms and attitudes governing their practice. Meeting these challenges will require richer opportunities for growth than those now provided for most teachers. They need time with their colleagues to examine their teaching and to revise curriculum. They need time to learn and practice new approaches, and they need training to prepare for the new responsibilities being thrust upon them. All of these activities fall under the general heading of professional development.

The Role of the States

How can states improve opportunities for teacher learning, and focus professional development activities in support of standards-based reforms? Most decisions about professional development are now made at the school and district levels. When state policymakers have addressed professional development issues in the past, they focused on funding, mandating in-service time, or raising recertification requirements. However, states can influence the focus, scope, and quality, as well as the quantity, of professional development. Here are steps some states are taking:

1. **Policymakers are asking how much is being spent on professional development, and how this money is being spent.** They want answers before spending more on professional development. Most states and school districts are spending much more than they know on professional development. The bulk of the spending goes not for workshops and conferences, but for salary increments awarded for obtaining graduate credits or degrees. Often

these credits and degrees are unrelated to teachers' current assignments or school needs. Before allocating additional funds, policymakers should find out what is currently being invested in teacher development and make sure it is put to good use.

Delaware, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina and a number of other states are making substantial new investments in professional development. However, only a few states are trying to track expenditures to determine how federal, state, and local funds are spent.

2. **Some states are conducting policy reviews to determine how their policies affect local decisions about professional development.** Does the state require district or school plans for professional development? How does required content affect the quality and nature of professional development? How do recertification requirements shape local decisions? Do categorical programs have their own professional development requirements? Review of state policies may reveal conflicts with principles of good practice and unnecessary prescription and complexity.

Colorado and Michigan, in cooperation with the National Governors Association, have recently conducted such policy reviews. A number of states, such as Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, New Mexico and Utah, initiated studies of professional development. Twelve states are conducting policy inventories in cooperation with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and the Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

3. **State policymakers are increasingly aware that local districts are likely to need some guidance, perhaps some incentives, to change their approaches to professional development.** Existing professional development routines are well-established and comfortable; they often are intertwined with collective bargaining agreements and recertification requirements. It is time to offer some guidance to local districts and providers about the characteristics of high-quality professional development. States should probably not set standards for professional development. But there seems to be an emerging consensus about the general principles that should guide professional development policies and programs.

States are using a variety of approaches to influence the quality of professional development provided by local schools. Thirteen states have developed standards and guidelines for local professional development. Kentucky and Massachusetts have attempted to establish systems for approving providers, and Michigan has been working with providers to improve the quality of their services.

4. **Time is the most critical, and most scarce, resource for professional development.** States are taking steps to provide more time, but state policymakers are becoming aware that simply adding more workshop days may do little to improve instruction. Blocks of time are needed for intense immersion to improve subject-matter knowledge and to try out new instructional approaches. Time during the workday is needed for follow-up and dialogue among teachers. This may mean more professional development days, but it also means re-thinking how time is used.

Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina and ten other states mandate that time be set aside for professional development. Numerous states have considered similar proposals but not acted because of their cost and impact on the length of the school year. Some state education agencies have started to provide districts assistance in scheduling to provide more interaction among teachers during the school day. A few states such as Indiana, Illinois and Tennessee allow schools to bank time for professional development by lengthening the school day.

5. **States are beginning to recognize the value of the informal learning** that teachers experience through professional activities such as serving on curriculum committees, serving as assessors for state and local assessment programs, working as mentors to new teachers, and working on curriculum development teams. These and similar activities involve teachers in reflection and dialogue about their classroom practice; they should be recognized as professional development, and should count toward recertification. Vermont, Virginia, and Massachusetts are states that have moved in this direction.

6. **Institutions of higher education are being encouraged to assume greater responsibility for professional development.** They train teachers and administrators, and have the capacity to provide continuing education. It makes little sense to circumvent publicly supported institutions of higher learning because of dissatisfaction with their graduates. Creating alternative systems to provide professional development is expensive, and only reinforces the status quo in higher education. We should make effective use of these resources or close the programs.

While many state officials complain about the unresponsiveness of institutions of higher education, there are promising new developments. Maine, Louisiana, and Wyoming are building higher education partnerships statewide. In Georgia and South Carolina, universities are involved in providing professional development. Nevada has established partnerships between its schools and community colleges to offer professional development in technology. Michigan, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Vermont and some other states are encouraging the development of professional development schools to be jointly run by institutions of higher education and school districts. Higher education institutions are heavily involved in most of the State Systemic Initiatives (SSIs) funded by the National Science Foundation.

7. **Teachers' unions and subject-matter organizations are being invited to play more active roles.** These organizations have a stake in improving the quality of the profession, and, in some places, they have taken the lead in offering better professional development. They are in the best position to disseminate information about professional development options, and to influence the preferences of their members. They have credibility with their members and established networks. Although many states have involved the state affiliates of the National Science Teachers Association and the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics in their SSIs, there is still limited use of teachers' organizations as vehicles for professional development. The subject-matter networks in California are probably the best example of how teacher organizations can contribute to professional development.

The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) is indebted to the chief state school officers and the many people from state professional development and teacher certification offices, professional associations, and institutions of higher education who took the time to assist in this study. They participated in lengthy interviews, provided important documentation, and reviewed their state profiles in draft form. Their cooperation and assistance were essential to this work.

The information presented in the profiles was collected through telephone interviews and document reviews conducted by CPRE staff in 1996. For each state, CPRE staff interviewed eight to twelve individuals knowledgeable about policies, programs, and practices affecting teacher professional development.

The initial point of contact was typically the chief state school officer who, in almost all cases, referred us to appropriate officials within the state education agency. CPRE researchers conducted a consistent set of core interviews across the fifty states that included, but were not limited to, representatives of: state education agency offices of professional/staff development and teacher certification; governor's offices; state education associations; schools of education; and the educational research community in the state.

CPRE researchers supplemented these core interviews with interviews of additional state officials, staff of professional standards boards, and, in most states, representatives of major professional development initiatives.

The interview information was augmented by review of documents and materials obtained from respondents. In addition, CPRE consulted its own data files from other research projects.

The information obtained from these sources is summarized in four page profiles of the professional development activity for each state. CPRE submitted draft profiles to each state education agency for review and comment in the summer and fall of 1996. Revisions were made to correct factual errors or omissions.

Neither the Carnegie Corporation of New York, nor the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking and Management in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, is responsible for any errors, omissions or misinterpretations in the state profiles. The profiles provide a portrait of the supports and opportunities for teacher learning in each state as of late 1996. We hope readers will bring any errors to our attention.

Guide to the State Professional Development Profiles

This collection of state professional development profiles provides a wealth of information on each of the 50 states. The following grid identifies the states that had taken particular actions to promote professional development for teachers as of the fall of 1996.

STATE INITIATIVES: The first three columns indicate which states have developed state plans for professional development, adopted state standards for professional development, and conducted statewide studies of professional development.

STATE REQUIREMENTS: The fourth and fifth columns identify the states that mandate the amount of time local districts must dedicate to professional development, and the states that require districts to develop local professional development plans.

STATE FUNDING: Columns six through nine show which states provide funding for local professional development, which states award competitive grants for professional development, which states fund professional development delivery systems, and which states offer statewide professional development programs.

INDUCTION PROGRAMS: Columns ten through twelve identify the states that mandate induction programs for new teachers, that have voluntary induction programs, and that provide funding for induction programs.

STATE INCENTIVES: Column thirteen shows which states require professional development for recertification, and column fourteen shows which states encourage teachers to seek certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

Guide to the State Professional Development Profiles

	<i>State Initiatives</i>			<i>State Requirements</i>		<i>State Funding</i>				<i>Induction Programs</i>			<i>State Incentives</i>	
	<i>State Plans</i>	<i>State Standards</i>	<i>State Studies</i>	<i>State Mandated Time</i>	<i>State Mandated Local Plans</i>	<i>State Funding for Local Professional Development</i>	<i>State Competitive Grants</i>	<i>State Funds for Delivery Systems</i>	<i>State-led Professional Development Programs</i>	<i>State Mandated Induction Programs</i>	<i>State Voluntary Induction Programs</i>	<i>State Funding for Induction Programs</i>	<i>Required for Recertification</i>	<i>Support for NBPTS Certification</i>
Alabama		•			•	•		•	•		•		•	•
Alaska			•		•			•	•				•	
Arizona			•		•		•			•			•	•
Arkansas			•	•	•		•	•	•					•
California								•			•	•	•	
Colorado	•		•		•					•				•
Connecticut				•	•			•	•	•		•	•	
Delaware		•	•	•	•	•			•		•	•		•
District of Columbia				•		•			•	•		•	•	•
Florida					•	•		•		•			•	
Georgia	•		•		•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•
Hawaii					•				•					
Idaho					•				•				•	
Illinois	•		•		•	•	•	•						•
Indiana	•		•		•		•		•	•		•	•	
Iowa	•				•	•		•					•	•
Kansas	•	•	•		•	•		•					•	
Kentucky		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•		•

	State Initiatives			State Requirements		State Funding				Induction Programs			State Incentives	
	State Plans	State Standards	State Studies	State Mandated Time	State Mandated Local Plans	State Funding for Local Professional Development	State Competitive Grants	State Funds for Delivery Systems	State-led Professional Development Programs	State Mandated Induction Programs	State Voluntary Induction Programs	State Funding for Induction Programs	Required for Recertification	Support for NBPTS Certification
Louisiana	•	•		•			•	•		•		•		
Maine	•		•		•	•				•			•	
Maryland	•		•					•	•				•	•
Massachusetts	•	•			•	•							•	•
Michigan	•	•		•	•	•		•		•			•	•
Minnesota		•			•		•	•					•	
Mississippi	•			•	•				•				•	•
Missouri			•		•	•		•	•	•			•	•
Montana			•	•	•						•		•	•
Nebraska				•			•	•					•	
Nevada													•	
New Hampshire					•								•	
New Jersey					•			•		•				
New Mexico			•		•				•	•				•
New York								•					•	
North Carolina			•			•		•	•	•			•	•
North Dakota	•	•			•			•	•				•	
Ohio			•			•	•	•			•	•	•	•
Oklahoma			•	•	•	•			•	•		•		•

	<i>State Initiatives</i>			<i>State Requirements</i>		<i>State Funding</i>				<i>Induction Programs</i>			<i>State Incentives</i>	
	<i>State Plans</i>	<i>State Standards</i>	<i>State Studies</i>	<i>State Mandated Time</i>	<i>State Mandated Local Plans</i>	<i>State Funding for Local Professional Development</i>	<i>State Competitive Grants</i>	<i>State Funds for Delivery Systems</i>	<i>State-led Professional Development Programs</i>	<i>State Mandated Induction Programs</i>	<i>State Voluntary Induction Programs</i>	<i>State Funding for Induction Programs</i>	<i>Required for Recertification</i>	<i>Support for NBPTS Certification</i>
Oregon					•		•	•						
Pennsylvania		•			•			•		•				
Rhode Island		•									•	•	•	•
South Carolina		•		•	•			•	•		•		•	
South Dakota													•	
Tennessee	•			•	•				•				•	
Texas					•			•		•				
Utah			•		•		•	•	•	•				
Vermont	•	•						•					•	
Virginia	•			•	•	•		•			•	•	•	•
Washington			•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	
West Virginia			•	•	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	
Wisconsin					•								•	
Wyoming	•				•								•	•

Alabama

Number of Teachers: 43,002**Average Years of Experience: 14****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 53%****Average Salary: \$28,659¹**

Education Policy Context

Alabama's K-12 public education system enrolls over 700,000 students annually. Spearheaded by new leadership, the Alabama Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is transforming itself from a highly regulatory to a service delivery agency. The state's education reform agenda focuses on student performance, local accountability, and critical capital needs.

A lawsuit concerning equity funding prompted the Alabama legislature to pass a new Foundation Law in 1995, which eliminates line-item restrictions for local budgets. However, in order to receive Foundation funds, districts must submit to the State Board of Education (SBE) an annual program plan for each of the following areas: physical plant, transportation, professional development, technology, special education, vocational education, and at-risk services. A state bond issue has added \$127 million for K-12 public education to support the new funding formula; local levies must also be maintained.

The legislature also passed an Accountability Law in 1995 to complement the new Foundation formula. The law charges the SBE with implementing a statewide assessment system (using a nationally norm-referenced test), identifying core curricula for elementary and secondary instruction, aligning teacher

preparation program approval requirements with core curricular goals, and implementing an assistance/intervention program for schools and school systems that fail to demonstrate improvement in student performance.

Beginning in the 1995-96 school year, the SBE annually receives and audits districts' fiscal plans in the seven Foundation Law-program areas. District plans that are not approved may be resubmitted after the SEA provides technical assistance for budget revision. Lastly, each district is required to distribute, for public record, an annual accountability report on the district as a whole and on each school under its jurisdiction. The report provides information on expenditures, student achievement, safety, and disciplinary matters.

The State Role in Professional Development

Alabama's professional development policies focus on the premise that viable opportunities are possible only when a legitimate commitment is made by the highest level of an organization's administration. In 1994, the SBE adopted a state policy for professional development, which established the SEA's Office of Professional Development, identified standards for professional development, required districts and schools to develop annual professional development plans, and linked teacher

recertification and evaluation to professional development. However, some of this activity was rescinded as of the 1996-97 school year (i.e., the Office of Professional Development was eliminated and the professional development standards are no longer mandated).

Teacher Certification Policies. Alabama has three levels of teacher certification: an eight-year Class B Professional Certificate; a master's level, ten-year Class A Certificate; and, for teachers who complete 33 semester hours beyond the master's degree, a 12-year Class AA Certificate. All three certificates are issued on a renewable basis, provided that the teacher has taught full-time for at least four, five, or six years, respectively, during the time period for which their certificate is valid. In addition, teachers must participate in their districts' annual professional development program or complete 12 semester hours (18 quarter hours) of undergraduate or graduate credit. Incentives are not provided for teachers who obtain National Board Certification. However, state law stipulates that once the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) program is fully implemented, any out-of-state teacher holding Board certification will be automatically eligible for reciprocal certification in Alabama.

The Beginning Teachers Assistance Program (BTAP) was created by the SEA in 1990. BTAP pairs a new

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

teacher with a trained mentor who observes, coaches, and provides feedback on classroom performance. The mentor and beginning teacher work in a formative mode, and all information they share remains confidential. The state issues guidelines for this program but offers no funding. Districts that volunteer to implement BTAP are responsible for training mentors, providing mentors' release time, and monitoring and evaluating BTAP activity. A full review of teacher certification rules and regulations is underway and should be completed with recommended changes by October of 1996.

In 1994, the state began piloting a performance-based teacher evaluation process. As of the 1997-98 school year, this evaluation will be mandated statewide. The SEA has constructed a list of teaching competencies that will serve as criteria for the evaluation. The evaluation itself will include classroom observations (conducted by the principal) and other documentation of teacher performance (e.g., lesson plans and participation in professional growth activities). During their first three years of service, teachers will be evaluated annually; thereafter, they will undergo evaluation every two years.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA conducts extensive professional development sessions on finance and instruction during the summer months. In 1996, more than 10,000 educators participated in this type of training. There is no charge to educators for participation in these activities.

Regional Inservice Centers (RICs) are the primary conduits for the state's technical assistance and professional development services. Created in 1984, there are currently 11 Centers located across the state. The Centers are university-based and are subjected to evaluation by the SEA every three years.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Alabama is participating in Goals 2000. Local education agencies may submit applications for Goals 2000 funds to the SEA. All funds are to be used for instructional technology (both hardware and software) and training for educators in the use of technology.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The Foundation Law identifies professional development as a mandated allocation within state and local budgets. During the 1995-96 school year, the state funding formula was \$60 per teacher unit, which was used to fund the RICs. In 1996-97, the funding formula increased to \$120 per unit. This allocation was split between the RICs (which received a total of \$2.6 million) and a direct allocation to districts at the rate of \$60 per teacher unit. The Foundation Law also allocates \$200 per teacher unit to support districts' technology programs. Technology funds may be used to purchase equipment, software, and training.

Federal Funds. During the 1995-96 school year, Alabama received a \$4.2-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant and a \$5.9-million Goals 2000 grant. Approximately \$200,000 in federal Chapter 2 and Title VI grants were used to fund SEA-sponsored professional development.

Local Funds. The Accountability Law requires local systems to allocate funds for professional development based on the rate appropriated per teacher unit by the Foundation Law.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

As of the 1995-96 school year, local systems and schools are required to design, implement, and evaluate an annual professional development plan in order to receive state-aid funds. Each district and school must create a professional development advisory committee, which is responsible for conducting a needs assessment to identify goals for the professional development plans. The state does not require teacher membership on the committee; however, it is strongly encouraged. Both plans are approved by local boards of education, but only the district plan is submitted to the SEA. All districts appoint a professional development contact person to serve as a liaison to the SEA.

The state school-year calendar includes five non-instructional days for teachers. These days are not mandated for particular activities and therefore may include in-service as well as school opening and closing activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Collective bargaining is not permitted in Alabama. Teachers' salaries are linked to certification status and the number of years of teaching experience they possess. While there are some exceptions, local systems rarely reimburse tuition.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Alabama Education Association (AEA) offers professional development workshops throughout the year, as well as a two-day conference in March that is attended by more than 3,000 teachers annually. AEA has designed 31 workshop packages that are delivered upon request to local systems by a team of 40 full-time field directors. During the 1994-95 year, the most frequently requested workshop topics were inclusion, site-based management, and grant writing. AEA professional development services are state-approved and are offered to districts and schools free of charge.

The Alabama State Teacher Forum (ASTF) was organized in 1994 by former recipients of the Alabama Teachers of the Year award to promote the role of classroom teachers as educational leaders in the state. ASTF is composed of 90 exemplary teachers, and its activities are governed by an eight-member Leadership Council. During the 1994-95 school year, ASTF conducted 15 statewide Teachers as Leaders workshops, which were attended by 650 teachers. In 1995-96, three regional workshops were conducted and attracted 450 participants. These free, one-day summer workshops bring classroom teachers together to learn about Alabama's education reforms and the innovative teaching strategies that will help them

meet reform goals. Teachers receive five continuing education units, awarded by Auburn University, for participation. Other ASTF activities include organizing teacher forums at the local level, coordinating a teacher electronic network, distributing teacher surveys, and providing information to state officials regarding teacher opinions and ideas on educational issues. In 1995-96, the ASTF conducted an Outstanding Educators Symposium that convened 70 exemplary Alabama teachers to share their knowledge and insights with members of the business community, elected officials, and educational leaders. The 1996-97 symposium will include approximately 100 teachers. ASTF is funded through private foundation and corporate contributions.

The Alabama Staff Development Council (ASDC) was created by a group of RIC directors in 1984 and became a state affiliate of the National Staff Development Council in 1989. ASDC serves to promote and sustain teacher professional development opportunities through advocacy with state officials, activities such as its annual two-day state conference, and a Best Practices Conference, which will be implemented for the first time in 1996. ASDC activities are governed by a Board of Directors, composed of the council president and vice president, as well as a representative from each of the 11 RICs. ASDC activities are funded through membership fees; 300 educators are currently registered with the council.

Contacts/Information Resources

Eddie R. Johnson
Assistant State Superintendent of
Education
Alabama State Department of Education
P.O. Box 302101
Montgomery, AL 36130-2101
334-242-9960

Anne Jolley
Executive Director
Alabama State Teacher Forum
P.O. Box 1562
Montgomery, AL 36102
334-279-1886

Robert Lipscomb
President
Alabama Staff Development Council
Merts Administration Building
200 White Street
Huntsville, AL 35801
205-532-4774

Publications and Reports

Professional Development: A Blueprint for Excellence, Alabama State Department of Education (policy brochure, 1995).

Professional Development Plan: Guidelines and Definitions, Alabama State Department of Education (1995).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Alaska

Number of Teachers: 7,193**Average Years of Experience: 14****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 35%****Average Salary: \$47,902¹**

Education Policy Context

Alaska is unique in its large geographical size and small population. There are 125,948 students enrolled in the state's 53 public school districts. The state faces the dual challenges of delivering quality education to students living in rural, isolated areas, and of providing quality professional development to teachers in remote areas. The state has addressed these challenges by developing live, interactive telecommunication formats, including conferencing and distributing audio and video tapes.

The state is engaged in education reform, and its Goals 2000 initiative, Alaska 2000, was cited as a major state priority in recent years. Through Alaska 2000, the state has developed content standards in math, science, social studies, and English. These standards have been adopted and are now being implemented. Standards for arts, foreign languages, and health education are currently being developed.

In addition, Governor Knowles has undertaken a Quality Schools Initiative with six major components: quality academic standards and assessments, quality standards for professional educators, quality school standards through a new school accreditation system, increased family involvement in education, reform of the state's education

funding program to achieve greater equity, and the establishment of a state educational endowment to provide long-term, stable funding for public education. The state is in the process of piloting performance assessment in writing.

The Alaska Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) established a Task Force on Teacher Certification that is addressing standards for educators by revising the state's teacher certification and preservice policies. The Task Force is also examining the accreditation of preservice programs. Only one institution of higher education in Alaska is currently accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

In May of 1996, the state legislature enacted HB 465, which increased from two to three the number of years a teacher must work before achieving tenure. It also required school districts to adopt an evaluation plan for teachers and administrators based on performance standards set by the SEA. The SEA, in conjunction with the Association of Alaska School Boards, established the Evaluation Project Committee, which is currently developing teacher performance standards and models for evaluation instruments that can be used by districts. HB 465 requires school boards to include students, parents,

community members, and professional educators in designing an evaluation system based on performance standards.

The State Role in Professional Development

Currently, there is no statewide plan for teacher professional development in Alaska. Professional development is a component of other statewide education reform efforts, such as the development of a new teacher certification system or the implementation of new student standards. The state's Professional Teaching Practices Commission advises the State Board of Education on issues regarding teacher licensure.

Teacher Certification Policies. After receiving a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher education and completing six semester hours of residency credit, teachers are eligible for a Type A teaching certificate. New teachers are considered to have provisional status for the first three years of their careers, although there is no state-mandated evaluation process for beginning teachers. The probationary period relates to employment and not to certification. New teachers who are certified through Alaska's alternate program receive an individualized certification plan listing professional development needs. Teachers certified in this

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

way are considered to be apprentice teachers and work with a trained mentor for one year.

All candidates for certification are required to take one course in multicultural education and one course in Alaskan studies. Teachers who have not completed these requirements prior to certification receive a two-year, non-renewable Provisional Certificate, during which they must complete the requirement. The Type A certificate is renewable every five years. In order to renew, teachers must submit a renewal application and fee and complete six semester hours or nine quarter hours of coursework during the five-year period.

The state is in the midst of redesigning its teacher certification and recertification policies. The Task Force on Teacher Certification is considering such elements as requiring individual professional development plans for educators and district professional development plans aligned with standards. The new performance standards and teacher evaluation policies are linked to employment, but not to recertification. The state is also considering recognizing or granting "Master Teacher" status to National Board Certified teachers.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA provides professional development in Alaska in a variety of ways. It offers conferences and workshops to help educators implement state initiatives, particularly regarding content standards; it maintains a state-run high school that serves as a training site for teachers; and it is also a partner in the Alaska Staff Development Network.

The SEA plays a key role in the Alaska Staff Development Network (called the Network), which is administered by the University of Alaska Southeast. The Network is a statewide partnership that includes the NEA-Alaska, the Alaska Council of School Administrators, Alaska's five universities and colleges, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 52 Alaskan school districts, as well as a number of professional associations for educators. Each year, approximately 3,000

Alaskan educators from all of the state's school districts participate in face-to-face and distance-learning training activities sponsored by the Network.

An executive committee that includes representatives from school districts, universities, professional associations, and the SEA governs the Network. An annual meeting of Network organizational representatives is held each March to review Network programs and establish Network priorities. In 1989, the Network was recognized by the National Council of States on Inservice Education as one of the nation's ten best staff development programs.

The Network is completing the first year of a three-year project to develop a comprehensive distance-learning training program, the Alaska 2000 Professional Development Coalition, which is funded by the U.S. Department of Education. The training programs enable teachers to address state and national standards in math, science, social studies, and English/language arts in their own classrooms through distance-learning courses. The courses were piloted in the spring of 1996 and will be made available statewide to all educators during the 1996-97 school year.

The Network collaborated with the SEA to develop a series of four training courses for the KIDS 2000 initiative. (KIDS stands for Knowledge Integration Designed with Standards.) The courses use the newly developed Alaskan Frameworks, national documents, and classroom examples and models to assist educators in implementing the new content standards and in redesigning classroom instruction to help students achieve the standards. The courses were offered in the spring of 1996; participating educators were awarded three college credits.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Alaska has used its Goals 2000 funding to support local improvement efforts and to develop and support the adoption of state content standards. These activities have included professional development for educators.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state budget for the professional development of Alaska's educators. The state does provide some technical assistance, conferences and workshops for educators. The state does not require that local funds be set aside for professional development.

Federal Funds. In Year 2 of Goals 2000, Alaska received \$1,547,345 to support local reform efforts. Ninety percent of these funds was allocated to local districts, and much of the funding was used to support teacher professional development. In FY 1995, Alaska received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funding to support professional development.

Local Funds. Districts are not required to set aside money for professional development. Policies regarding spending for professional development vary widely by district.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

There are state requirements for professional development related to fetal alcohol syndrome, sex equity, and child abuse, but school districts are not currently required to establish staff development plans. Many districts do create professional development plans, however, and some also maintain professional development committees.

The SEA requires that districts submit plans describing how they intend to use scheduled professional development days. Districts are allowed to use up to ten days for in-service activities; the state does not mandate a minimum number of days. How in-service topics and which major providers of professional development are selected varies greatly by district. Universities provide some professional development opportunities, and many districts use their own staff or hire private consultants.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Alaska's teachers bargain over professional development at the local level, although this process varies from district to district. Teachers may bargain for time to pursue professional development and for the content of in-service activities.

Depending on the individual district's resources, teachers are sometimes reimbursed for professional development costs and are sometimes provided leave time to pursue professional development. Teachers generally receive salary increments based on professional development activities. Again, the policies vary by district and by contract.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The NEA-Alaska offers professional development to its members through conferences and workshops. NEA-Alaska staff work with the NEA program, Team Approach to Better Schools, in which teachers collectively manage a school with the principal. One Alaska school is currently participating, and another has expressed interest. NEA-Alaska paid for the training of two teachers, the principal, and a staff member at the participating school. A number of subject-matter organizations in Alaska also provide professional development opportunities for their members.

The Alaska State Writing Consortium, housed at the University of Alaska in Juneau, is funded by a National Writing Project grant and by local district subscriptions, and is affiliated with the Bay Area Writing Program. The Consortium provides professional development for teachers and uses a trainer-of-trainers model, in which teachers attend initial courses and later apply to become fellows. After completing a series of institutes, fellows return to their districts and train other school staff.

District subscriptions cost \$1,000 per year. Approximately one-third of Alaska's teachers have participated at some level in Consortium training.

Higher education institutions provide professional development to teachers through course offerings, and they help to develop professional development opportunities through the Network. The University of Alaska houses the Writing Consortium and the Network, helps to solicit grants to support teacher professional development, and shares technological resources, such as access to the Internet.

Contacts/Information Resources

Chris Niemi, Administrator
Teacher Certification and Education
Alaska Department of Education
Goldbelt Place
801 West 10th Street, Suite 200
Juneau, AK 99801-1894
907-465-2441

Bonnie Barber
Alaska Education Association
3198 Judge Arend Avenue
Fairbanks, AK 99709
907-479-4442

Kelly Tonsmaire
Director
Alaska State Development Network
University of Alaska
907-465-8744

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Arizona

Number of Teachers: 37,493

Average Years of Experience: 13

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%

Average Salary: \$31,825¹

Education Policy Context

Arizona's K-12 public education system is comprised of 226 school districts, many of which are rural and half of which serve fewer than 600 students. Under the direction of its elected state superintendent, Arizona is moving ahead on several major education reform fronts. First and foremost is the belief that schools should be unencumbered by rules, regulations, and bureaucracy. In "A Vision for Education Reform in Arizona," released on February 15, 1996, State Superintendent Lisa Graham Keegan outlines her reform agenda, calling for a student-centered system in which "exceptional schools run largely independently" and are supported by state-of-the-art technology.

Regarding instructional areas, the plan calls for clear, measurable academic standards; career majors for high school students; performance-based and norm-referenced state tests and state graduation requirements; additional paid days for teachers to participate in specific, ongoing professional development and training, including 20 extra paid days every three years; a residency/mentorship program that will license educators based on their ability to teach to high academic standards; additional instructional days in grades three and four to ensure proficiency in mathematics and reading; parental involvement; adult

literacy programs; alternative educational programs; and funding for safe-schools legislation. Regarding finance issues, the plan specifies funding for low-wealth schools that have immediate building needs; a construction and debt commission to examine facilities funding; exploration of better funding mechanisms for buildings; exploration of interest payments on bonds; a finance system that facilitates "dollars following students" on a real-time basis; and funding for unmet special education costs.

Arizona is a leader in charter schools reform, with 126 such schools in operation. Although some of these schools are governed by a separate state board, the downsized and restructured State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is responsible for providing information and technical assistance services to these schools. Because of the autonomy afforded charter schools, each school must be treated as a separate district.

The State Role in Professional Development

Central to Arizona's plan for student improvement is intensive, focused professional development specifically tied to students' needs. The state superintendent regards professional development and teacher certification as corner-

stones of her education reform vision. She states, "We must set high standards for teachers and create a professional development structure conducive to meeting these standards." In 1995, a professional development skills review committee was formed. The committee is comprised of representatives from parent groups, teacher and administrator organizations, and colleges of education and serves an advisory role to the State Board of Education (SBE). The committee has recently drafted standards for teacher preparation, induction, and continuing professional growth based on Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) recommendations, as well as teaching competencies adopted by other states.

The proposed standards represent a shift away from prescriptive certification policies in favor of a system based on proficiency assessment. If adopted by the Arizona SBE, the new system would be implemented during 1997. The standards are structured around three phases. At the Pre-service Preparation Phase, education programs would undergo a state approval process to ensure that their curriculum corresponds to the teacher standards and prepares teachers to pass subject-matter assessments that are aligned with student standards. The Induction Phase would require beginning teachers to participate in a district-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

sponsored support program and pass a performance assessment. During the third phase, continuing teachers would be expected to implement an individual professional development plan based on the teacher's professional interests, the teacher's knowledge of the state standards for students, and the school's improvement goals and objectives.

Teacher Certification Policies. The proposed teacher standards would establish a two-year Provisional Certificate issued to beginning teachers who had completed either a traditional or state-approved training program and had passed a professional and content-area test. Provisional teachers would be required to participate in a Beginning Teacher Support System mentoring program and pass a performance assessment in order to receive the Standard Certificate. The Standard Certificate would be renewable every six years, upon district verification that the teacher had completed an individual professional development plan consisting of a minimum of 180 clock hours (or 12 semester hours of university coursework). It would be possible to earn professional development hours through activities such as district in-service, professional seminars, academic coursework, training to conduct Phase II performance assessments, serving in a professional leadership role, educational research, or serving on an accreditation team.

State-Supported Programs. Before the SEA was downsized and restructured, it offered considerable professional development opportunities. While SEA staff still provide some professional development for teachers, this function is no longer primary. However, under the reorganization, a new Office of Professional Development and Certification was created. A concerted effort is being made to tie together all aspects of teacher professional growth, from preservice to in-service activities.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. More than 90 percent of the Goals 2000 funds allocated in the first two years of Arizona's Goals 2000

program was used to support the planning and implementation of comprehensive local education plans, including those of charter schools. Some of this funding was expended by schools to provide professional development.

The Phoenix Public Schools District is the recipient of a five-year, Urban Systemic Initiative (USI) grant from the National Science Foundation. This grant provides funding for teacher professional development in mathematics and science.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not allocate funds to districts specifically for professional development. However, members and constituent groups from the skills review committee are searching for a sponsor to introduce legislation that would provide state funds to districts in support of Phase II and Phase III activities. Arizona's Career Ladder program is being implemented in 29 districts. In 1996-97, the state allocated \$26,272,491 to support the Career Ladder program; local supplements totaling \$13,562,560 statewide also fund this program.

Federal Funds. Arizona received Goals 2000 grants of \$1,362,358 in 1994 and \$5,450,582 in 1995, and the state expects to receive \$5,043,051 in 1996. Arizona also received \$3,115,704 in Eisenhower funds for K-12 professional development in 1995.

Local Funds. Much of the state's local professional development dollars appears to be acquired through Career Ladder funds. Some districts use a portion of these funds for staff development, which is offered to teachers systemwide, regardless of their participation in the Career Ladder program. The amount differs widely in the districts that have career ladders, and there is no state requirement to expend money on professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Arizona, like many other states, has a strong state-level vision that is implemented according to local decisions. Local districts are required to have a professional development plan. State monitoring of local professional development plans is done informally. Since there are no in-service days in the official school-year calendar, the allocation of time for professional development is determined at the districts' discretion.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

In Arizona, all bargaining for professional development occurs at the local level. Teachers may apply for Career Ladder salary supplements, which are awarded based on performance. Teacher organizations also help local members negotiate career ladders, and in some districts, pay for performance initiatives.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Arizona Education Association (AEA) is collaborating with US West to establish links among teachers for exchanging information, networking, and training using the Internet. In another partnership with US West, the AEA, SEA, and other educator associations are initiating a project to provide technology training and equipment for a number of teachers throughout the state. The AEA also will collaborate with the National Education Association (NEA) and a local university to begin a charter school, and it has committed to provide the professional development necessary to make the school a success.

Northern Arizona University (NAU) is participating in a number of school-university partnerships across the state. NAU faculty, sometimes working full-time at the district site, assist schools in the design and implementation of teacher development and training activities. NAU also served as host for the annual Teacher Leaders' Retreat, which provides leadership training for teachers. NAU is currently collaborating with districts across Arizona to identify and design professional development course packages that meet district and teacher needs and that may potentially apply toward graduate degree requirements. Arizona State University (ASU), the University of Arizona (UA), and Grand Canyon University also have established school-university partnerships in localities adjacent to their campus sites; most of these partnerships include a professional development component for partner school teachers.

Contacts/Information Resources

Caryn Shoemaker
Director of Professional Development
1535 W. Jefferson Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-5529

Penny Cotterman
Vice President
Arizona Education Association
100 W. Clarendon, Suite 1600
Phoenix, AZ 85013
800-352-5411

Jon Engelhardt
Executive Director
Center for Excellence in Education
North Arizona University - Box 5774
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
520-523-7139

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

* Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Arkansas

Number of Teachers: 26,014
 Average Years of Experience: 14
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 33%
 Average Salary: \$28,312¹

Education Policy Context

Arkansas is largely a rural state with over 440,000 students in its public education system. Many of Arkansas' individual schools are very small; in 1993, there were over 60 high schools with graduating classes of less than 25 students. The tradition of local control over public education is strong in the state's 311 school districts. However, with the advent of recent reform initiatives, the state has been playing an increasingly larger role in implementing policy that directly affects schools.

In 1991, the Arkansas General Assembly enacted Act 236, also known as the "Meeting the National Educational Goals: Schools for Arkansas' Future" subchapter. The legislation is considered to be the cornerstone of the state's education reform efforts and included a number of independent, but interrelated, reform initiatives. It required the State Board of Education to adopt student learner outcomes, which were subsequently disseminated to schools. It also required the General Education Division (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) of the state's Department of Education (which includes both the General Education Division and the Division of Higher Education) to develop a plan to align statewide curriculum frameworks with student performance assessments and

teacher professional development activities. The statute called for a total restructuring of the state's public education system in order to achieve national education goals; the SEA was charged with developing a ten-year plan to restructure the system. It also required that a task force be appointed to make recommendations on the design and implementation of a new system of outcome-based licensure for beginning teachers and administrators. The task force is currently reviewing preliminary drafts of its recommendations. The Act also required the SEA to provide technical assistance to all schools involved in restructuring and, ultimately, to restructure itself in order to better provide leadership and support to facilitate school and system restructuring.

To support its intended school-improvement efforts, Act 236 also established the Arkansas Academy for Leadership Training and Site-Based Management (discussed in further detail below).

The State Role in Professional Development

Arkansas plans to incorporate professional development for teachers into its overall restructuring plan for its public education system. As mentioned above, Act 236 called for the integration of professional development for teach-

ers and administrators with the development of new curriculum frameworks and student assessments. From 1991 to 1996, the state provided competitive grants of up to \$20,000 per year to approximately 16 schools to support local restructuring, which included planning and professional development activities. Act 236 also required the SEA to provide training, technical assistance, networking, and other support to schools involved in restructuring.

Another reform-related measure, Act 1307, was passed during the 1995 legislative session. It required the SEA to conduct a study of professional development activities and opportunities in local schools. The resulting report discusses the content of professional development activities, funding and released time for teachers, accountability systems related to professional development, human resources, and statistics that demonstrate school progress in implementing professional development in support of restructuring. This report, presented to the legislature in September of 1996, will be used to determine the future role of the SEA in facilitating professional development in local schools.

Teacher Certification Policies. The SEA is in the process of revising its existing licensure and certification system. The state was required by Act 236 to establish a task force to review this issue. Once the work of the task force is

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

completed and its recommendations are adopted and implemented, the state's licensing system will be changed to reflect state goals for outcome-based education. The task force is currently developing an outcome-based system for the licensing of beginning teachers and administrators based on high and rigorous standards. As part of this process, the task force intends to examine the issue of recertification for licensed professionals.

Under the current licensure and certification system, prospective teachers with a bachelor's degree who have completed an approved teacher education program can obtain a "Standard Certificate," which is a six-year credential renewable with teaching experience. The only existing recertification requirement for educators is that they have taught during the previous credentialing period. Teachers are not required to undergo any evaluation or professional development in order to renew their licenses, although there is an evaluation process for educators that is not linked to recertification. A teacher who earns a master's degree can obtain a ten-year, renewable "Master Certificate."

State-Supported Programs. One state program established to strengthen the education workforce is the Academy for Leadership Training and School-Based Management, which is administered by the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville. A coalition of universities, professional associations, businesses, corporations, educational cooperatives, and the SEA was established to create the Academy. It provides training programs and opportunities to develop the knowledge base and leadership skills of educators, including teachers, principals, superintendents, other administrators, and school board members. It offers training in four major areas: district support, leadership development, research information and technology, and the identification and recruitment of minority leaders. One of the goals of the Academy is the creation of learning communities in local schools, which also includes a focus on professional development. The Academy uses workshops and retreats to bring teams from districts together to work on issues

they have identified. It also hosts a series of institutes for teams, individuals, and teacher coaches.

The state also supports a system of Regional Education Service Cooperatives (RESCs) that provide a range of services to most districts in the state; one of their primary functions is to offer professional development. Currently, there are 15 RESCs operating in Arkansas, and they involve every district in every county, except one. They are the largest provider of professional development to teachers, primarily through workshop-style, one-day events. The RESCs survey the districts that they service and offer professional development based on district needs. Each district pays a yearly fee of approximately \$1,000 for membership in its RESC. Teachers are sent by their districts to participate in classes, workshops, and lectures.

The K-4 Initiative was created by the Governor's Office and resulted in legislation in 1991 mandating that students in grades K-4 who do not perform at grade level attend summer school. In addition to funding, a large staff development component accompanies this program. Teachers who want to teach summer school are required to participate in targeted staff development. Modeled in part after the highly successful Math Crusades program (discussed below), the K-4 Crusade includes a seven-day training program focusing on hands-on math and science and language-based reading and writing, as well as a related six-hour graduate course that focuses on integrating math and science with reading. The graduate course is offered by 11 universities throughout the state, in conjunction with the Arkansas Statewide Systemic Initiative (also discussed below), the SEA, and the Division of Higher Education. The professional development program began in January of 1995; to date, over 1,400 educators have participated in the graduate course, while over 4,000 have participated in the seven-day training program.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Arkansas has a strong Statewide Systemic Initiative, known as the Arkansas Statewide Systemic Initiative (ASSI), that provides professional

development to teachers in the areas of math and science. The ASSI has ties to state government, the Arkansas Education Association, and the Arkansas Leadership Academy. The program builds upon Arkansas' successful Math Crusades, which provided a highly intensive staff development program for teachers in grades 5-12 in the use of manipulatives (objects that can be used as learning tools), cooperative learning, and performance assessment. ASSI is jointly administered by the SEA and the Higher Education Division. The ASSI's goal is to identify, train, and support a math/science leader in every local school by the end of 1998.

Arkansas has participated in the Carnegie Middle Grades School State Policy Initiative (MGSSPI) since 1991, which has provided funding for professional development in middle schools. In 1995 alone, Carnegie provided Arkansas with \$230,000 to support professional development activities. The state also participates in Goals 2000 and the New Standards Project and is considering adopting the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for teacher education.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the Arkansas state budget that specifically targets professional development for teachers. The Arkansas Leadership Academy is funded as a line item in the state's budget; however, the Leadership Academy has other responsibilities in addition to its professional development activities, and it is unknown what percentage of its budget is allocated for professional development. Approximately \$9 million per year is spent on the K-4 Initiative, and \$2 million of that appropriation is earmarked for staff development. RESCs also receive state funding. The state allocated \$250,000 per year from 1991-1996 for the restructuring grants program discussed above. The bulk of those funds was spent on local professional development and planning activities in schools.

Federal Funds. Federal dollars that flow through the state's Department of Education (such as Goals 2000, Eisenhower, and Chapter 1 and 2 funds) are the most heavily relied upon sources of funding for professional development in Arkansas. For example, of the total funding Arkansas received in Year 2 of Goals 2000 (\$3,650,495), 90 percent became district subgrants to continue local education reform efforts. Local districts, in turn, support professional development activities with this funding. Arkansas also received \$2,499,159 in federal Eisenhower grants in FY 1995.

Local Funds. Districts are not required to spend any set amount on staff development. They rely heavily on grant money from the state and other sources to fund these activities.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Teachers are required by the state to receive 30 hours of staff development every year, although this requirement is not attached to recertification. There are state guidelines regarding how the 30 hours should be spent. Districts are responsible for developing plans outlining how they will provide opportunities for teachers and fund professional development activities. They may offer release time for teachers to pursue activities outside the district or provide professional development that occurs on the school site.

Districts can accumulate time to provide professional development for teachers if they hold classes beyond the required 5.5-hour school day. Up to 30 minutes each day can be accumulated, and can then be used to dismiss students early and to provide time for in-house staff development. In order to use the time, districts must first submit a plan to their field services representative in the SEA.

Previously, districts regularly provided the SEA with reports and information on their staff development plans—not only in instances in which banked time was requested or when districts were up for accreditation. This review

policy was discontinued. Districts now provide the state with their professional development plans when schools are up for accreditation every five years. State standards for accreditation are currently under revision, and it is expected that the new standards will attempt to link teacher classroom performance with professional development activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

There is no collective bargaining at the state level for professional development. However, professional development compensation is bargained for in some districts. According to the state office of the Arkansas Education Association (AEA), approximately 22 districts have formal language in their contracts pertaining to professional development.

Compensation for professional development activities varies widely from district to district, depending on a district's size and available resources. Some larger districts provide reimbursements to teachers for college courses and other professional development costs, while most smaller districts do not. Most teachers pay their own professional development expenses. The awarding of salary increments also varies by district. Many districts award salary increments for college coursework; however, continuing education units (CEUs) generally do not count toward an increase on the salary scale.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The AEA provides a range of professional development opportunities for its members. Legislation was passed that ensured teachers the right to attend the annual AEA conference and to count this participation towards their professional development requirement. The act was recently amended to include other professional organizations' conferences as well. In addition, the AEA provides training and stipends to its teacher members, so that they can train other teachers on site.

Active content-related teacher organizations, including the Arkansas chapter of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, provide professional development to their members. Other groups, such as the Arkansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Arkansas Association of Educational Administrators, are active in promoting professional development for teachers.

Higher education plays a significant role in providing professional development and in shaping policy in Arkansas. The Higher Education Division has worked with the SEA on its task force to review the state's teacher certification policy. Universities across the state are working with local schools to provide training to preservice teachers. Higher education institutions are partners in the Arkansas Leadership Academy (which is currently administered by the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville), the K-4 Initiative, and the ASSI. They are also major participants in many of the state's other activities regarding professional development.

The Walton Family Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation were both mentioned as supporters of education in Arkansas. They provide some support for professional development activities to individual teachers doing exemplary work in the classroom.

Contacts/Information Resources

Beverly Reed, Director
Arkansas Leadership Academy
153 Graduate Education Building
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
501-324-9300

Betty Gale Davis
Program Support Manager
Internal Professional Development
Arkansas Department of Education
General Education Division
Little Rock, AR 72201-1071
501-682-4475

Cora McHenry, Executive Director
Arkansas Education Association
1500 West Fourth Street
Little Rock, AR 72291-1064
501-375-4611

*Sources: National Resource Data Center
and National Center for Education Statistics,
U.S. Department of Education. Figures are
for 1993.*

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



California

Number of Teachers: 221,779**Average Years of Experience: 15****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 33%****Average Salary: \$40,636¹**

Education Policy Context

California is a large and diverse state, home to one in every seven babies born in the United States. Nearly five and a half million students are enrolled in more than 1,000 school districts, and an increasing majority of California's students are members of minority groups. Children with special needs, particularly those with limited English proficiency, pose an increasing challenge for the state's education system. Public support for education sharply declined during the 1980s; however, this shortfall in local tax revenue led to a 1988 state constitutional amendment requiring that 40 percent of the state's budget be spent on public education.

Since the mid-1980s, the California Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) has assumed a leadership role by adopting discipline-based curriculum frameworks that are used to guide instructional activities at the local level. A new state performance-based assessment, the California Learning Assessment System (CLAS), was developed to be tightly linked with the frameworks. However, Governor Wilson vetoed the CLAS reauthorization bill due to criticisms regarding the state's test. In October of 1995, a new state testing program, the California Assessment of Academic Achievement, was authorized

for development. The legislation authorizing the new assessment also called for the creation of the Commission for the Establishment of Academic Content and Performance Standards to develop new standards by July of 1998. Once these standards are in place, the SEA will be responsible for designing matching assessments that contain elements of thinking skills and performance-based assessment, while at the same time reasserting the role of more traditional test formats and basic skills. Implementation timelines for the new assessments have not been established.

The SEA introduced the Challenge Districts initiative in 1995. Challenge Districts must: (1) adopt measurable content and performance standards for every subject in grades 2-10; (2) implement a performance-based assessment system in conjunction with existing annual assessments; (3) provide an annual local accountability report on student performance; (4) increase by 2 percent annually those students who perform at or above the standard; and (5) have 90 percent of all students performing at or above the standard by the year 2005. As of the summer of 1996, 50 districts had registered for this initiative.

Results of the 1995 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) fourth-grade reading exam ranked California fourth graders last in the nation in reading performance. The NAEP findings have prompted state

officials to focus school reform efforts at the elementary level, primarily through a re-introduction of "phonics" for reading instruction and a reduction of class sizes in primary grades. Governor Wilson proposed legislation (SB 1777), passed in June of 1996, to provide funding to reduce class size/teacher ratios to 20 to 1 at the primary level. Funding is provided annually at \$650 per student for full-day class size reduction and \$325 per student for half-day class size reduction. Districts must submit an application to the SEA to receive these funds. Districts are required to provide staff development to teachers who participate in the class size reduction program. A one-time, state-wide appropriation of \$200 million is available for the facility upgrades needed to support the program.

The State Role in Professional Development

In the 1980s, then-Superintendent Bill Honig sought to initiate systemic school reform in several ways. To provide a common subject-area vision, seven curriculum frameworks were developed. The frameworks were intended to serve as key policy documents for curriculum and instruction, textbook selection, and the development of assessments. Prior to the development of these frameworks, the success of the Mathematics and Writing Projects initiated by the University of California had

begun to influence thinking regarding professional development. A state-commissioned report suggested that these programs provided a useful professional development model. In response to the report, the Professional Development Act (SB1882) was passed in 1988. This bill created the California Subject Matter Projects and the Professional Development Consortia (see below).

Teacher Certification Policies. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is an autonomous board with policy-making authority in all aspects of state teacher preparation policy. CTC establishes credentialing requirements, conducts educational research, sets accreditation standards, evaluates institutions to ensure that standards are met, and administers required testing programs. Its activities are funded by teacher licensure fees.

Teaching credentials are offered at two levels, the Preliminary Credential and the Professional Credential. The five-year, nonrenewable Preliminary Credential is issued to candidates who possess a bachelor's degree, complete a teacher preparation program, and pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Out-of-state teachers are eligible to receive a one-year, nonrenewable credential and must pass the CBEST in order to obtain the Preliminary Credential. During their first two years of employment, teachers are expected to demonstrate facility in the teaching of reading, principles of the U.S. Constitution, and subject-matter knowledge by completing a CTC-approved college course or by taking the appropriate Praxis Series Subject Assessment.

In order to receive the Professional Credential, teachers must pass courses in health education, mainstreaming exceptional education children, and computer education, as well as successfully complete 30 credits beyond the bachelor's degree, or a fifth-year program, approved by a California teacher preparation institution. (The fifth-year program may consist of in-service training for which college credit is given.) Once obtained, the Professional Credential is renewable every five years if the candidate teaches at least one semester and completes an

individual professional growth plan comprised of 150 clock hours. Participation in National Board Certification provides another way for teachers to meet this requirement.

To address the growing numbers of students with limited English proficiency, the CTC developed and implemented special standards for CLAD (Crosscultural Language and Academic Development) and BCLAD (Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development) certification for both beginning and experienced practitioners.

With an influx of 14,000 new teachers into California classrooms each year, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the SEA piloted the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) from 1988 to 1992. Its purpose was to study alternative methods of supporting and assessing teachers who are new to the classroom. In 1992, the legislature and governor enacted SB 1422, which requires the Commission and the SEA to jointly administer a Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program to provide support for new teachers during their first and second years of service. Through the BTSA Program, the CTC and SEA are developing innovative methods for assessing the performance of new teachers. School districts, in collaboration with universities, develop regional and local proposals to receive BTSA funds from the state. It is estimated that 10 percent of first- and second-year teachers participate in BTSA programs. In addition, the California Teacher Mentor Program (begun in 1983) provides each district with money for mentor teacher stipends, training, and release time.

State-Supported Programs. The mission of the California Subject Matter Projects (CSMPs) program is "to improve instruction in all disciplines at all grade levels throughout California. A secondary mission is to establish and sustain a vibrant professional culture of and for teachers, one that provides teachers with ongoing support and opportunities to address the myriad challenges of teaching in California's... schools."

CSMPs have been formed in the disciplines of writing, mathematics, sci-

ence, the arts, literature, foreign language, history-social science, and international studies. The university-based CSMPs operate through regional sites that are each managed by a director and coordinated statewide by an executive director. Local teachers often serve as site co-directors.

A core feature of the CSMPs is their extended, regional summer institutes which typically last three to four weeks and attract approximately 50 teachers per region. Other CSMP activities include Saturday workshops during the school year, leadership academies, teacher research groups, and newsletters. It seems that most teachers enter the program through their involvement in a summer institute. In some cases, teachers are paid to attend these institutes; in other cases, they are awarded college credit, which advances them on the salary schedule. The CSMPs focus almost entirely on pedagogy and content. The CSMPs have had an important "spin-off" effect: supporting teachers as leaders, both inside and outside their classrooms and schools. It is estimated that 20 percent of all California teachers have been involved in some type of CSMP activity.

The state also has established regional Professional Development Consortia to assist in brokering professional development, based on the needs of the districts they serve. There are ten regionally located Professional Development Consortia in California.

The SEA Office of Professional Development is a small administrative mechanism with four full-time staff that oversees the BTSA Program, the Bilingual Teacher Training Program (see below), the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes (see below), and special grants programs to provide teacher training. This office is responsible for scheduling bimonthly meetings with directors of the Professional Development Consortia. It also works collaboratively with the CSMPs.

The Bilingual Teacher Training Program (BTTP) was established by the legislature in 1981 to assist districts in providing specialized staff development training for non-bilingual licensed teachers who work under waiver agreements

in classrooms with limited English proficiency (LEP) students. Thirteen bilingual teacher preparation centers, housed within county offices, were established to provide training in teaching methods for English-language acquisition. BTTP is designed to assist teachers in obtaining CLAD certification, which authorizes them to teach LEP students, and/or BCLAD certification, which allows them to teach in bilingual classrooms. Participating teachers undergo an extensive curriculum that enables them to understand the culture and history of a particular language group, apply appropriate methods and strategies when teaching LEP students, and, for BCLAD certification, acquire a second language. Program activities are funded by the state with matching and in-kind support from participating districts and county offices. Since its inception, approximately 20,000 teachers have participated in BTTP.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The California Alliance for Mathematics and Science (CAMS) is funded by a five-year Statewide Systemic Initiative grant from the National Science Foundation. CAMS is centered around two major content-based networks. Mathematics Renaissance (MR) is working to improve mathematics instruction in hundreds of California's public middle schools. The California Science Implementation Network (CSIN) is assisting elementary teachers in the teaching of high-quality science. Both networks are designed to facilitate the use of the mathematics and science frameworks by teachers. The strength of these initiatives seems to lie in their teacher networks and the intensive summer professional development experiences that these networks provide to teachers.

California also receives federal Goals 2000 funds. In 1994-95, the state awarded Goals 2000 subgrants, which funded 169 consortia representing approximately 1,600 schools. In 1995-96, 75 percent of Goals 2000 funds was targeted for staff development in reading.

Various foundations, located inside and outside California, are involved with professional development projects at the local level. The Rockefeller and Panasonic Foundations are assisting San Diego Schools with their service delivery system, and the Galef Institute works throughout California supporting the work of primary teachers with coaching, mentoring, and in-class and out-of-class assistance. The Annenberg Foundation is supporting large reform initiatives in the Bay Area and in Los Angeles County that include extensive professional development.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. In 1995-96, the state allocated approximately \$15 million for SB1882 initiatives—\$11.2 million for the CSMPs and \$5.2 million for the Professional Development Consortia. Other state allocations in that year for professional development included \$68 million for the mentor teacher program, \$5 million for the BTSA Program, \$1.2 million for the BTTP, and \$800,000 for the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes.

The CTC annually awards state grants of \$6.5 million for teacher internship programs and \$1.5 million for Career Ladder Programs in teaching.

While California does not provide categorical funds for professional development at the district level, the state did distribute over \$300 million during 1995-96 for school improvement—encouraging, but not requiring, that the funds be used for professional development.

Federal Funds. Goals 2000 funding totaled \$10,524,929 in 1994, \$42,111,705 in 1995, and \$39,246,198 in 1996. In 1995, California received \$23,274,800 in Eisenhower funds for professional development and over \$800 million in Title I funds.

Local Funds. There is no requirement for districts to support professional development with local funds. The majority of professional development expenses at the local level is incurred through the provision of substitutes and stipends.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

As a matter of state policy, districts are not required to design or implement a local professional development plan. Since 1977, the state has authorized that up to eight non-instructional days may be incorporated into the school-year calendar. Most districts use four or five of those days for professional development. Non-instructional days, also referred to as "school improvement program days," are funded by the state.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The terms and conditions for professional development are determined through local bargaining agreements. Salary schedules are generally determined based on years of experience and additional college credit earned beyond the bachelor's degree, such as continuing education units, the master's degree, and the master's degree plus 30 credits.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The involvement of teacher organizations in the provision of professional development appears to vary widely from district to district. Teacher organizations offer workshops and other training opportunities to help teachers with shared governance issues and classroom management, among other topics.

Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes represent partnerships between the education programs of public colleges and school districts. Thirteen partnerships have been formed.

Contacts/Information Resources

Walter Denham, Manager
Professional Development Office
California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-657-2768

David Wright
Director
Professional Services Division
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-445-8097

Robert Polkinghorn
Director, Academic Collaboratives
Office of the President
University of California
300 Lakeside Drive, 18th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-3550
510-987-9505

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Colorado

Number of Teachers: 33,661
Average Years of Experience: 14
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 49%
Average Salary: \$33,826¹

Education Policy Context

Colorado's 192 public school districts enroll 620,000 students. Education policy is generally made at the local level, although Colorado is currently implementing a state-level education reform initiative based on standards for student achievement. The 1993 Standards and Assessment Act established a nine-member Standards and Assessment Development and Implementation (SADI) Council charged with establishing academic content standards and recommending teacher professional development resources in support of the standards. The SADI Council has adopted rigorous proficiency standards and new assessments in math, science, reading, writing, history, and geography. Adoption of the state-developed standards or locally developed standards that equal or exceed them was intended to take place locally between January of 1995 and January of 1997.

Colorado passed the Educator Licensure Act in 1991. This law established a three-tiered licensing system requiring teachers to meet performance standards in order to move from a provisional license (tier one) to a professional license (tier two), and then to a master teacher certificate (tier three). The Act also requires new teachers to participate in an induction program with a mentor. Full implementation of the new

recertification requirements is expected by 1999.

The State Role in Professional Development

The Colorado state government has been addressing professional development for teachers through the SADI Council. The state is also attempting to improve coordination among the various teacher development efforts in Colorado.

The Education Licensure Act created two standards boards, one for teachers and one for administrators. These boards have the authority to recommend regulations for licensure. In addition, a subcommittee of the SADI Council, called the Subcommittee for Professional Development, has worked with the Colorado Staff Development Council to develop model professional development plans that districts can implement locally. These model plans were intended to be completed by April of 1995.

Teacher Certification Policies. When fully implemented, the Educator Licensure Act will dramatically change teacher certification requirements in Colorado. New teachers will have to pass a written assessment and participate in a three-year induction program under the guidance of a mentor. The induction program will also provide training in standards-based education. New teachers, as a part of their

performance evaluation, will participate in peer observation and coaching activities. They have a three-year provisional certificate during their induction period. After the induction program, they become eligible for a professional license.

Under the Educator Licensure Act, professional or career teachers must meet specific performance standards to maintain their licenses. In the past, recertification was based on the number of credit hours earned. Under the new system, teachers have to demonstrate high levels of competence in academic subjects and familiarity with state content and assessment standards. Teachers who demonstrate an advanced level of competence in teaching, administration, or special services will be eligible for master teacher certification. Professional teachers must renew their licenses every five years. Master teachers renew their licenses every seven years.

State-Supported Programs. In 1993, the state received a \$10,000 grant from the National Governor's Association to convene a Working Group on Professional Development to assist the SADI Council in its professional development work. The Working Group was established in May of 1994. The group consists of 24 representatives from many of the state's education organizations and related professional organizations. The Governor's Office hired a consultant

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

to staff this project. The Working Group has completed a survey of local school districts regarding their professional development services and their teachers' knowledge of standards-based education. The Working Group presented recommendations for best practices in teacher professional development to the SADI Council and to the state's Board of Education. To date, no specific action has been taken regarding the recommendations. Information about successful practices was disseminated widely among local superintendents. Currently, there is a new committee involving the state Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) and the Governor's Office that is exploring the creation of a statewide plan for professional development.

The SEA has created a Standards-Based Education Professional Development Task Force (SBEPDT) to focus on professional development policy issues. The SBEPDT is identifying models of effective professional development that are consistent with standards-based goals, and is coordinating work with that of the SADI Council's subcommittee on professional development and the state Working Group. The SADI Council will review the research literature on professional development programs and services appropriate to implementing standards-based education. This information will be housed in a resource bank located at the SEA and accessible to local districts.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Colorado is participating in other initiatives related to professional development. The federal New Standards Project provides training in performance assessment strategies, and the Statewide Systemic Initiative (called CONNECT in Colorado) supported by the National Science Foundation, which provides professional development opportunities for teachers in math and science. Colorado is also an Re:Learning state.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state budget dedicated to professional development. The Standards and Assessment and the Educator Licensure laws did not appropriate funds for professional development for teachers. However, there is school finance legislation pending that would require local districts to set aside funds for professional development activities. Currently, no such requirement exists. The bill would provide \$10 million for professional development grants to be awarded according to criteria set by the state Working Group on professional development.

Federal Funds. Colorado receives Goals 2000 and Eisenhower funding for professional development. In FY 1995, Colorado received \$2,934,164 in Eisenhower funds.

Local Funds. Local funding is the largest source of professional development funds. There is currently no state mandate for a minimum amount to be budgeted for professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The 1993 survey conducted by the state Working Group on Professional Development revealed wide disparities in expenditures for teacher professional development among the districts. Expenditures ranged from a minimum of \$500 per year in small districts to a maximum of \$350,000 in very large districts. Responsibility for planning professional development activities varied between the district office and school-level personnel.

The Standards and Assessment Act has been implemented by local districts in different ways. Some districts dismiss students early one day each week to provide time for teacher professional development. Other districts have done

little or nothing. Local districts are expected to adopt new standards by 1997 and to select appropriate professional development programs. Each district must submit a professional development plan to the state by 1997. Development, implementation, and delivery of professional development programs will be handled by school districts in conjunction with their affiliated Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES).

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is sometimes addressed in local bargaining agreements. Local units usually bargain for release time and salary increments for professional development activities.

When district resources allow, teachers may be reimbursed for professional development costs, such as tuition or travel expenses. In some districts, teachers receive increases on the salary schedule for completing credit hours in university courses. Local districts determine what professional development activities merit salary increases; however, these credit hours currently do not have to be linked to teaching assignments. Occasionally, teachers receive stipends for professional development activities.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Colorado Education Association (CEA) informs state policy in different ways. The CEA supported both key pieces of reform legislation, serving on state committees that helped develop the legislation and the criteria to implement it. At the request of districts or individual teachers, the CEA provides professional development workshops for local districts in the areas of licensure, standards, and inclusion for special education students.

Privately sponsored programs have helped to develop teacher networks across district lines in Colorado. These include the Colorado Staff Development Council and the Colorado Partnership for Education Renewal.

In addition to their other functions, BOCES serve as regional resource centers for districts and provide professional development for teachers. BOCES are responsible for managing the new teacher induction program at the local level and preparing teachers for license renewal.

The Colorado Staff Development Council is a statewide group for staff developers in all of the state's districts and university personnel who provide professional development to districts. Its primary function is serving as a source of professional support for its members. This organization is represented on state-level professional development committees and has been involved in most of Colorado's state-level professional development initiatives.

Institutions of higher education provide professional development for teachers. The University of Northern Colorado provides district staff training in the development of enrichment programs in math and science. The University of Colorado at Denver maintains close ties and provides staff development to its local district. All 12 state institutions of higher education involved in CONNECT are working with districts to implement math and science standards.

Eagle Rock is a residential high school and teacher training facility established in 1983 by the American Honda Corporation. Its Professional Development Center provides continuing education through its workshops, research projects, conferences, and publications. Other important professional development resources not supported by the state include: the Literacy League, founded by the Public Education Coalition, which provides mentors to teachers; Partners in Science, founded by the Colorado Alliance for Science in

1991, which provides science teachers with summer jobs in science-related industries; and the Aesthetic Education Institute of Colorado, sponsored by Colorado Young Audiences, which offers elementary teachers a summer program focused on arts education.

Contacts/Information Resources

Gene Campbell
Director of Teacher Certification and Education
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-6851

Bill Porter
Director of Policy
Governor's Office
136 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-4666

Frank Johnson
Director of Professional Development
Colorado Education Association
1500 Grant Street
Denver, CO 80203
303-837-1500

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Connecticut

Number of Teachers: 34,526
 Average Years of Experience: 17
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 62%
 Average Salary: \$50,389¹

Education Policy Context

Connecticut's public K-12 system consists of 166 school districts and serves over 500,000 students. On average, communities fund 56 percent of local education costs. Therefore, local districts are strongly independent and have considerable autonomy in decisions regarding curriculum. State policy makers provide leadership by setting the visions for education reform at the state level, giving local decision makers encouragement and support to help them move in the desired direction. The centerpiece of Connecticut's reform efforts is the Common Core of Learning (CCL), adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education (SBE) in 1987, which outlines the essential skills and learning objectives for grades K-12. Districts voluntarily adhere to these objectives, which are written in general terms and are not subject-matter specific. Attempts to create state curriculum standards that are more specific and regulatory in nature have been met by substantial public opposition. However, state frameworks have been developed to provide guidance for local curriculum development.

Standards for teacher performance and professional growth also have provided an impetus for achieving education reform goals. In 1986, then Governor William A. O'Neill signed into law the Connecticut Education Enhance-

ment Act (EEA), which aimed to attract, educate, induct, and retain high-quality teachers. The EEA was based on recommendations from the Governor's Equity in Educational Excellence Commission, which met from 1984 through mid-1985 to examine and propose regulations for teaching standards. While this legislation is best-known for making the salaries of Connecticut public school teachers the highest in the nation, its mission goes much further. Through initiatives such as the Beginning Educator Support and Training (BEST) Program, Connecticut policy makers have created a system that provides support and assessment for beginning teachers and incentives for experienced teachers to engage in an ongoing process of professional growth.

The State Role in Professional Development

The EEA called for a "professional development continuum" to upgrade teaching standards by strengthening preparation, certification, and professional development programming at the state and local levels. The EEA requires beginning teachers to participate in a program of induction, which provides a foundation in basic classroom teaching competencies and pedagogical theory. Beginning teachers must meet general competency standards and pass a performance-based assessment in order

to move forward on the certification continuum. To support professional growth for continuing classroom teachers, districts must provide professional development opportunities and award continuing education units (CEUs), which teachers may then apply towards their recertification requirement. In addition, the state-operated Institutes for Teaching and Learning (ITLs) provide intensive training opportunities for teachers and administrators.

Teacher Certification Policies. Connecticut has an Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards that serves at the discretion of the SBE. Governor, and state legislature on matters pertaining to teaching standards and certification. There has been some discussion and debate in recent years regarding the creation of a Professional Standards Board that would have authority to set policy on issues of licensure, education program accreditation, and teacher evaluation. Thus far, no such entity has been created.

Beginning teachers are issued a two-year Initial Certificate during which time they must complete a teacher induction program (see below). Successful completion of the induction program leads to the Provisional Educator Certificate, a non-renewable, eight-year certificate. After three years of teaching experience and the completion of 30 semester hours beyond the bachelor's or master's degree, provi-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

sionally certified teachers may apply for the Professional Educator Certificate. In order to maintain their Professional Educator Certificate, teachers must accumulate nine CEUs every five years. One CEU is awarded for every ten contact hours. In addition to tuition-free CEU workshops provided by the district, teachers may select from an array of courses or workshops that are offered by 150 other state-approved CEU providers, such as universities, regional educational service centers, and businesses.

The BEST Program was introduced in 1989. Through BEST, beginning teachers are paired with veteran classroom teachers trained as mentors in the areas of peer coaching, team teaching, and using instructional resources. BEST also provides new teachers with training in "teaching competencies" which are used to evaluate their performance. The Connecticut Competency Instrument (CCI), designed by the state's Bureau of Research and Teacher Assessment and by Connecticut educators, allows a trained classroom observer to rank beginning teachers' skills along ten indicators. The results of the classroom observations are compiled and measured against a performance standard (acceptable, conditional, unacceptable) which is then used to determine a recommendation for future teaching status. New teachers must successfully complete the BEST Program in order to receive a provisional certificate.

In 1992, the Connecticut State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) introduced a series of pilot studies to develop and refine portfolio assessments, which would be used in conjunction with the CCI to measure beginning teachers' teaching activities. This new assessment component focuses on teachers' understanding of concepts specific to their instructional content areas. Through its participation and leadership in national initiatives such as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiative Project, Connecticut has developed a discipline-based teacher performance evaluation that uses teaching portfolios

to evaluate beginner teachers' growth in specific content areas. These modifications are currently being implemented for secondary teachers in science and mathematics. In 1995-96, pilot studies for art, music, and physical education teachers were phased in; during 1996-97 elementary and middle school teachers will participate in the new evaluation process.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA oversees teacher certification and professional development activities through its Bureau of Certification and Professional Development. The SEA handles all application and processing procedures required for teacher certification activities and is responsible for approving all training programs that are eligible to award CEUs. The SEA publishes an annual listing of the more than 150 providers in the state that offer CEU-approved workshops and courses.

Teacher assessment programs are managed through the Bureau of Research and Teacher Assessment. The Bureau of Curriculum and Instructional Programs offers statewide training seminars, local technical assistance, and resource publications on curriculum development and alignment across disciplines. The SEA also sponsors the Cooperating Teacher and Mentor Program, which provides training to experienced classroom teachers who serve as mentors for beginning teachers and support student teachers.

SEA staff manage the ITLs, which are one- or two-week summer workshops for teachers and administrators. The SEA also employs a cadre of curriculum and assessment specialists who provide technical assistance to districts on site and through statewide sessions conducted throughout the school year. The state collaborates with other professional development providers and teacher organizations located throughout the state.

Connecticut's Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs) have existed since the mid-1960s. They respond to the requests and needs of local districts by offering technical assistance and training. Collectively known as the Connecticut Alliance, the six RESCs each serve, and are supported financially

by, a "cluster" of districts. The Alliance also receives an annual state appropriation and numerous subcontracts from the SEA to conduct training activities for the BEST and ITL programs. It is estimated that 10 percent of all teachers' professional development opportunities are conducted by these regional centers.

In 1995, the SEA introduced the Urban and Priority Schools Initiative, which provides additional state funding to 14 school districts that serve large concentrations of at-risk students. Participating districts receive technical assistance and funding support to develop special programs in early childhood education, dropout prevention, parental involvement, and before- and after-school programs. Urban and Priority Schools grants range from \$680,000 to \$1.3 million, 7 percent of which is set aside to support statewide and local professional development.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. A Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) supports Connecticut's Project CONNSTRUCT, which offers teachers professional development opportunities in the areas of math and science. The over-arching goal of CONNSTRUCT is to make reforms in science, mathematics, and technology a high priority for state and local policy makers. The project is managed by the Connecticut Academy for Education in Science, Mathematics, and Technology, which is a free-standing, non-profit organization that serves as an advocate and catalyst for reform. The Academy is collaborating with the SEA to develop math and science curriculum frameworks for the state and is mobilizing policy officials, business leaders, K-12 educators, college educators, scientists, mathematicians, civic groups, social service providers, and education organizations in support of a common reform vision in order to develop a "professional community." From this group of leaders, the Academy selects fellows to assist school districts in understanding and utilizing the resources that are necessary for reform. While CONNSTRUCT targets urban districts, approximately 54 of the state's 166 districts have participated in some way in this program.

CONNSTRUCT funds other major in-service providers, such as the Project to Increase Mastery of Math and Science and Talcott Mountain, and has attempted to coordinate all professional development activities in the state funded by the NSF.

A portion of Goals 2000 funds is being used to support professional development school initiatives that focus on teacher enhancement and school improvement. Twenty-five university-district partnerships received subgrants during 1994-95, and 75 new partnerships received funding in 1995-96.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not provide a categorical allocation to support professional development activities at the local level (the EEA-authorized funding for this purpose was eliminated in 1992). Since 1984, state funds have supported the ITLs. Funding in recent years has been appropriated at the following levels: in 1994-95, \$500,000; in 1995-96, \$475,000; and in 1996-97, \$328,000. Although funding to support the BEST and Cooperating Teacher programs has declined considerably over the years, the 1995-96 appropriation was \$3.3 million.

Approximately 1.2 percent of the total state education budget is appropriated to support operating costs for the six RESCs. The SEA allocated \$25,000 in 1995-96 (down from \$100,000) to support the "Celebration of Excellence" teacher recognition program. The Urban and Priority Schools Initiative was allocated \$16 million for 1996-97. Seven percent of the funds for this initiative is used to support professional development.

Federal Funds. Connecticut received a \$2.3-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant for the 1995-96 school year. Project CONNSTRUCT is supported primarily through a five-year, \$7.8-million grant from the NSF. Approximately \$120,000 in Goals 2000 subgrants have been awarded to support schools' professional development initiatives.

Local Funds. There is no mandated set-aside for professional development funding at the local level. Discretionary use of funds obtained through general state aid and federal sources allow districts to support their professional development programs, should they choose to do so. It is estimated that districts spend up to 3 percent of their budgets on professional development—a particular consequence of fiscal constraints.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The EEA mandates that local districts provide 18 hours of CEUs per year, so that teachers can earn credits to maintain or advance their teaching certification. The content of professional development programs is determined at the local level. Thus, the frequency, quality, and content of in-service activities vary across districts.

In 1993, legislation was passed (Public Act 93-353) requiring each local and regional board of education to develop a comprehensive professional development plan based on guidelines issued by the SEA. Professional development plans went into effect during the 1994-95 school year. The guidelines, issued in December of 1993, require districts to align professional development with their local strategic plan's goals and to work with the teachers' union in creating the plan (although the plan does not require the union's sign-off or approval). Districts can participate in SEA-sponsored technical assistance workshops to help create their plans. Currently, the state neither provides funding to implement district plans, nor approves or monitors the plans.

The official school year calendar does not set aside a minimum number of in-service days. SEA officials report that, on average, local districts allocate three to five days for teacher in-service activities per year. District staff are considered to be the primary providers of teacher training at the local level (75 percent), followed by RESCs and SEA

staff (10 percent each), and outside consultants (5 percent).

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries are negotiated at the local level. Salary enhancements are awarded based on years of experience and advanced degrees earned. Seldom are enhancements assigned based on the accumulation of CEUs. Most local teacher contracts include a provision for tuition reimbursement at an annual flat rate of \$125.00 for coursework in which the teacher's final grade is "B" or better. This reimbursement policy does not apply if the teacher is earning credits towards an advanced degree.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Teacher associations are a key source of professional development opportunities. The Connecticut Education Association offers a statewide annual "Professional Development Day" and, throughout the year, provides technical assistance and training to local districts. Services to local sites are available upon request and are offered free of charge. Teaching networks, such as the Association for Teachers of Mathematics in Connecticut (ATOMIC) and the Foreign Language Teachers Association, have been cited as leaders in promoting collegial forums and professional growth opportunities for teachers.

The private sector also has provided resources to stimulate teacher recognition and professional growth. Connecticut's major telephone service provider, Southern New England Telephone (SNET), sponsors the Celebration of Excellence program, which rewards innovation in curriculum development. Each year, approximately 100 teachers are recognized and invited to attend a Summer Institute to work with past celebrants on design strategies to disseminate their innovative curriculum ideas to other school sites. "Adaptor Grants" of \$400 are available to teachers

who are interested in implementing celebrants' curriculum ideas in their own classrooms. The Celebration of Excellence is funded by SNET with supplemental support from the SEA. Although SNET will no longer serve as a sponsor after the 1995-96 year, the SEA expects to continue this program through support from other private sources. A second well-known teacher recognition program is the Milken Family Foundation Educator Award, which provides unrestricted awards of \$25,000 to five Connecticut public school educators (three teachers and two administrators) each year. Past and present recipients participate in an annual education conference to stimulate ongoing professional development and networking opportunities.

There are several professional development school models currently operating in the state. Working with the Hartford School District, the University of Connecticut is implementing a five-year program. Connecticut College, Southern Connecticut State, and Connecticut Central State University also have established partnerships with school districts that provide student teachers with an intensive, school-based learning experience. Postsecondary institutions, in turn, offer continuing teachers opportunities to participate in the design and implementation of college courses, workshops, and seminars.

The Connecticut Alliance for Arts Education, in conjunction with the Connecticut Commission on the Arts and the SEA, sponsors the Higher Order Thinking (HOT) Schools of Connecticut Program. HOT Schools participate in a five-day residential summer institute to examine the role of the arts in integrated curriculum and to develop arts-integrated projects for the classroom. Currently, teachers and administrators at six HOT Schools sites participate in three staff development workshops and are provided a 15-day artist-in-residence component. HOT Schools teachers are being trained as in-service leaders and will eventually be assigned to assist other schools in their regions to develop integrated curriculum projects. All teachers and principals receive CEUs for HOT Schools training.

Contacts/Information Resources

Betty Sternberg
Associate Commissioner
Division of Teaching and Learning
Connecticut Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue, Room 305
State Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106-1630
860-566-8113

Abigail Hughes
Chief
Bureau of Certification and Professional Development
Connecticut Department of Education
165 Capitol Avenue
State Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106-1630
860-566-2117

Daria Plummer
President
Connecticut Education Association
21 Oak Street, Suite 500
Hartford, CT 06106-8001
860-525-5641

Publications and Reports

The Other Side of the Equation: Impact of the Teacher Standards Provisions of the Education Enhancement Act. State of Connecticut Board of Education (1992).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Delaware

Number of Teachers: 6,380

Average Years of Experience: 16

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 48%

Average Salary: \$37,469¹

Education Policy Context

Delaware is a small state with a public K-12 system organized into 19 districts, three of which are vocational/technical school districts serving grades 9-12 only. Among its 182 schools, the state enrolls approximately 110,000 students per year. In 1992, the State Board of Education (SBE) and Department of Public Instruction (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) launched a standards-based reform initiative called "New Directions for Education in Delaware," which sought to give local systems greater autonomy and control over school improvement designs. The focus was to transform public education in three main areas: content standards; performance-based assessment; and deregulation. Definitions and measures of what students should know and be able to do are determined at the state level; local systems have the flexibility in the choice of curriculum and instruction used to reach learner goals.

The curriculum frameworks for mathematics, science, English/language arts, and social studies were adopted in June of 1995 by the SBE. Delaware then began to build a new state assessment that incorporated performance-based measures in reading, writing, and mathematics. Framework commissions are now engaged in developing content stan-

dards in the visual and performing arts, foreign languages, agricultural science, and finance, business, and marketing for approval by the SBE in June of 1997. Additional commissions in vocational education and comprehensive school wellness are planned. Each 45-member commission includes representation from every district, and is co-chaired by either a teacher or university faculty member and a business representative.

Concurrent with these reform efforts, the Business/Public Education Council engaged in their own analysis of Delaware's educational system and issued a "Gap Analysis Report" in 1993. Governor Carper formed a 26-member Education Improvement Commission (EIC) in August of 1994 to develop an overall strategy to merge the recommendations from both initiatives into one coherent, cost-effective plan addressing governance and accountability, finance, and communications. The EIC final report, issued in September of 1995, called for creation of a "decentralized education system" that would locate decision making at the school-building level and use a high-stakes accountability process of incentives and monitoring support. During the 1996 session, the General Assembly passed legislation in support of charter schools and school choice, site-based management, and school finance reform.

The State Role in Professional Development

Delaware has established professional development standards for public school educators. The "Elements of Quality Professional Development" were developed through the collaborative efforts of the SEA, the Delaware Education Research and Development Center (University of Delaware), the Center for School Change (Delaware State University), and the Delaware Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI). The evaluation system developed to investigate practice in relation to these elements is being used throughout the state and nation.

Teacher Certification Policies. Currently, entry-level teachers are issued a Standard Certificate, which is valid for five years. After three years of consecutive teaching experience, a teacher is eligible to advance to the Professional Status Certificate, which is also valid for five years. Renewal requirements are the same for both certificates; teachers must have three consecutive years of experience in their area of certification and six semester hours of college coursework.

The Professional Standards Council (PSC) was formed in 1991 to research and identify professional competency standards for Delaware teachers and to develop an education plan for certifica-

tion and career development. The 21-member PSC advises the SBE and is comprised of representatives from the SEA, district- and school-level staff (including eight classroom teachers), institutions of higher education, state legislators, the Governor's Office, and parent associations. PSC members are appointed to two-year terms by the state superintendent from nominations of their respective groups.

In December of 1993, PSC introduced the Educational Plan for Certification and Career Development, a three-tier

continuum of preservice education, the induction of new teachers, and career development for experienced teachers. The plan links teacher preparation and professional development activities to the state's goals for student learning. Under the certification regulations proposed by PSC, beginning teachers would be issued a three-year initial license and would have to participate in an induction program. The requirements for the Professional Certificate would be performance-based. This approach measures teacher performance to ensure

competency in pedagogy, subject area and the use of standards-based assessment.

Districts interested in implementing mentoring programs for new teachers have been able to receive state subgrants since 1994-95. These funds may be used for mentor training, mentor and new teacher stipends, and substitutes to provide time for observations and conferences. Eight districts participated in this program during 1995-96, and all 19 districts are expected to be involved by 1997-98. The PSC is revising its recertification proposal, and legislative action is anticipated during 1997-98. Teacher standards drafted by the PSC have received preliminary approval from the SBE and are undergoing public review during 1996-97.

State-Supported Programs. To improve state management and support of reform activities, the SEA was reorganized into four branches: Administrative Services, Standards and Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability, and Improvement and Assistance. SEA-sponsored professional development activities are coordinated by the Standards and Curriculum Branch. Participation in SEA training events is usually voluntary, although a mandatory statewide in-service program is occasionally implemented. SEA involvement with national reform initiatives such as Statewide Systemic Initiatives (SSIs), New Standards, Re:Learning, and INTASC has fostered the development of leadership cadres among local educators in performance assessment, school-based planning, teacher portfolios, and other areas.

The Delaware Teacher Center was started by a regional cluster of districts (Kent-Sussex) in 1981 with a U.S. Department of Education grant; it has evolved into a statewide, state-funded organization. The Teacher Center manages eight regional professional development centers. Teacher representatives from all 19 districts participate on the Teacher Center's governing/policy board, which also includes SEA staff and representatives of institutions of higher education. The Center provides an estimated 450 in-

Elements of Quality Professional Development

Appropriate Content

- incorporates content knowledge and research-validated practices that support demanding content standards;
- links new knowledge to the prior knowledge of participants;
- delivers content appropriate to the needs of participants.

Ongoing and Sustained

- long-range in nature, recognizes that learning is incremental and needs to be supported over time;
- sustained as a coherent effort for a minimum of 2-3 years and not consisting of single events, weekend conferences, or activities that recur over a year with different people.

Active Engagement

- allows participants to experience through first-hand and active engagement the curriculum, pedagogy, or assessment activities that serve as a model of what needs to occur in the classroom;
- consists of activities that are inquiry-based, varied, and engaging.

Collegial

- structured to serve teams of professionals that work together on *real* work;
- involves developing curriculum, problem solving, reflection about pedagogy, the development of a common language, and engagement in reciprocal observation and feedback.

Job-Embedded

- embedded in the routine organization of the school day and year and viewed as integral to school functioning;
- requires participants to plan and reflect upon their professional activities and practice.

Systemic Perspective

- incorporates all groups involved in the education of children;
- includes all parts of the system that have a role and responsibility in the change process and must shift practice in concert with each other.

Client-Focused and Adaptive

- based on the interests and needs of the participants and the schools they serve;
- based on formal analyses of needs;
- demonstrates a balance between the support for institutional initiatives and for those initiated by participants.

Incorporates Reflection

- provides time for participants to analyze and reflect, with opportunities for infusion of new information as well as criticism and guidance from external sources;
- enables participants to challenge, enhance, and make connections to practice.

service workshops each year, free instructional materials and supplies, on-loan equipment, and a professional home where teachers share new ideas. The Center's Policy Board is actively engaged in the education reform network and disseminates quarterly updates through its professional development centers.

The Delaware Center for Educational Technology (DCET) was formed in 1995 to create a modern educational technology infrastructure in Delaware's public schools. In collaboration with the SEA, the Center provides workshops in the summer and throughout the year. DCET plans to train approximately 20 percent of school staff, who will support the rest of the faculty.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. Goals 2000 funds support local curriculum development activities. The SEA provides technical assistance to ensure that curricula are aligned with state standards. Carl D. Perkins funds support statewide training for secondary teachers in the applied physics curriculum.

Project 21 is Delaware's SSI, which is supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. Project 21 activities, implemented in 34 schools, focused on assisting teachers in developing curriculum and using existing curriculum resources that are consistent with state standards for mathematics and science. Teachers attended two-week summer institutes: school teams representing all 34 sites also convened at various points during the school year. Project 21 staff served as specialists in curriculum instruction and assessment and worked on-site with school staff and through teacher networks. Professionals from 150 schools have participated in Project 21. The project has influenced state policy and practice by facilitating the design of professional development standards and modeling current thinking about effective professional development practice.

Delaware has been involved since 1992 with the New Standards Project (NSP), a national standards-based curriculum and assessment development project sponsored by the National Center on Education and the Economy

and funded by The MacArthur Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts. NSP has provided teacher training on development, application, and scoring of performance-based assessments, and on linking Delaware state content standards with those of other states.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The legislature has appropriated \$2 million to support local curriculum development efforts linked to content standards. The non-competitive grant funds may be used for training, planning, in-service programs, and contractual services related to curriculum development. The average grant award was \$250 per FTE during 1995-96 and \$317 per FTE for 1996-97. The EIC recommended that the state establish a permanent set-aside in its education budget for professional development.

Competitive state grants supported local beginning teacher mentoring programs with \$140,000 in 1995-96. The state spends about \$500,000 per year to provide teachers free summer tuition and tuition reimbursement. Roughly \$600,000 is allocated annually to support a teacher-to-teacher cadre that disseminates best practice methods. Other state funds for teacher professional development in 1996-97 include: \$286,000 for the Delaware Teacher Center; \$105,000 for the Delaware Institute for Arts in Education; and \$175,000 for the Center for Educational Technology.

Federal Funds. In 1995-96, Delaware received a \$1.24 million Goals 2000 grant and a \$1 million Eisenhower grant. Both grants primarily support professional development.

Local Funds. Districts rely heavily on state and federal funds to support local professional development. Local funding of professional development is at the discretion of the district and varies considerably across the state. The PSC has recommended that districts be required to allocate local funds for training materials, consultants, and transportation related to professional development activities.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

To receive state funds for curriculum development, districts must submit a plan describing the staff development to be conducted. Every district is assigned an SEA liaison who provides technical assistance. Twice a year, districts submit status reports to the SEA on their curriculum development activities. Districts must allocate five days each year for teacher in-service activities. Both the EIC and PSC recommend increasing this minimum to give teachers additional time to learn, plan, and implement new strategies.

A few districts offer teachers the option of participating in a voluntary Personalized Inservice Program (PIP). The conditions of the PIP are determined locally through collective bargaining. PIP provisions generally allow individual teachers to pursue professional development programs on their own instead of attending a district or state in-service day.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Delaware's state salary schedule (which accounts for 70 percent of a teacher's total salary) awards a step increase for a master's degree. Since 1976, Delaware teachers have been able to earn salary increments for participation in Professional Growth Programs (PGP). Teachers may earn PGP credit through graduate study, undergraduate study, in-service credit, or individual growth credits. In 1992, the SBE created the State Inservice Review Committee to ensure that professional development opportunities for PGP credits meet quality standards. In-service course proposals submitted by an individual, district, or agency must be approved by the committee as "relevant and usable." PGP credit is based on an equitable conversion formula representing semester, continuing education unit, or contact hours earned. One credit is awarded for every 15 contact hours of in-service activities; one-fifth credit is awarded for

every three contact hours completed. Teachers advance one step (approximately \$800) on the state salary scale for every 15 credits earned.

Teachers may apply for tuition reimbursement from the state for courses taken during the school year. Teachers may attend summer school courses free of charge at any public postsecondary institution in Delaware which is paid for by special appropriation and the institutions of higher education. PSC is developing models for teacher recognition—including incentives such as salary increases, release time, and classroom resources—earned for achieving degrees, National Board Certification, and other professional milestones.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Delaware State Education Association (DSEA) offers courses and workshops during the school year. The annual three-day Summer Leadership Academy features a full day of in-service courses. DSEA is exploring creation of a professional development institute that would permit participants to earn graduate credits toward an advanced degree. DSEA recently became a co-sponsor of the Delaware Teacher Center.

The Delaware Education Research and Development Center was established in 1993 by the University of Delaware and the SEA. The Center serves as a think tank, providing expertise in shaping state standards, professional development, teacher assessment, curriculum design, and educational finance. Center activities focus on five areas: support of school efforts to reform curriculum, teaching, and assessment; data-driven decision making; studies, analyses, and publications; evaluation of systemic reform; and ad hoc evaluation support to districts and schools. The Center is primarily funded by the Delaware Business/Public Education Council, with supplementary support from federal, state, and private sources.

The University of Delaware College of Education has been a member of the Holmes Partnership since 1985. The University has established professional

development schools (PDS) in partnership with several districts, including Appoquinimink, Christina, and Milford. The PDS sites serve teacher education programs in the same manner that teaching hospitals serve medical education. The University offers student teaching and clinical partnerships in the New Castle County and Cecil County, Maryland, districts. The College of Education and the Educational Testing Service have pioneered since 1988 the use of Praxis 3 tests in a student teaching format.

Contacts/Information Resources

Valerie Woodruff
Associate State Superintendent for
Improvement and Assistance
Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903-1402
302-739-3772

Bill Barkley
Executive Secretary
Delaware Professional Standards
Council
Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903-1402
302-739-4686

Paul LeMahieu
Director
Delaware Education and Research
Development Center
University of Delaware and the Delaware
Department of Public Instruction
Newark, DE 19716
302-831-4433

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



District of Columbia

Number of Teachers: 6,056
 Average Years of Experience: 18
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 54%
 Average Salary: \$43,014¹

Education Policy Context

District of Columbia operates a public school system comprised of 164 schools, serving approximately 80,000 students annually. In 1991, the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) launched a reform initiative, bringing together educators, business leaders, and community members to prepare a local Goals 2000 plan. In June of 1992, the DCPS released the report, *Building Learning Communities: A Framework for Preparing Students for the 21st Century*, which presented a vision of school restructuring grounded in the philosophy of "learning communities." The report also identified areas for improvement: early childhood education; curriculum reform and learner outcomes; mathematics, science, and technology education; graduation requirements; arts appreciation; parental involvement; and school accountability.

To implement this new vision, in 1994 the DCPS developed a strategic plan, entitled "Bringing Educational Services to Students" (BESST). BESST focuses on three areas: (1) performance-based education; (2) shared decision making; and (3) staff development. The primary thrust of BESST is to grant schools autonomy and decision-making authority and to shift the central office's role to that of facilitator and resource provider. A performance-based system

was launched in 1994 through a five-year Curriculum Renewal Initiative to develop curriculum frameworks and a new student assessment system. The frameworks are being developed under the guidance of a 24-member Curriculum Coordinating Council (CCC), which is composed of classroom teachers, principals, and SEA staff. A school-based management system is also being implemented, with the establishment of Local School Restructuring Teams (LSRT) at each school. The teams are comprised of administrators, teachers, parents, students, support staff, and community representatives.

Extensive reforms lie ahead for the DCPS. In 1995, the U.S. Congress created the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (henceforth referred to as the Authority) to repair the District of Columbia's financial condition and improve the management effectiveness of its governing agencies. The Authority issued a report in November 1996 entitled, *Children in Crisis*, which stated that DCPS was failing in its mission to educate children, citing low academic achievement, unsafe schools, poor leadership, and mismanagement. Shortly thereafter, the Authority approved the takeover of the DCPS, appointed a new superintendent, and created a nine-member board of trustees to assume most of the responsibilities of the elected school board (which has

been reduced to an advisory role). DCPS's professional development services, as described below, reflect activities as of December of 1996.

The State Role in Professional Development

Capacity building and staff development are cornerstones of the district's educational restructuring efforts. To assist schools with the implementation of reforms, the DCPS's Center for Systemic Educational Change (CSEC) provides technical assistance to local schools and trains personnel in new strategies and practices to improve overall school performance. In addition, BESST refined DCPS's policy statement on employee development and training opportunities (which was first adopted by the district's Board of Education in 1980). The current policy states that:

There will be leadership training to facilitate short-term planning, long-term planning, and the work of the Local School Restructuring Teams. There will be opportunities to learn alone and in collaboration in "multilevel programs" in which teachers, principals, district-level educators, and others jointly participate. There will be on-site study groups focusing on topics of particular interest to participants and course offerings with recertifica-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

tion and graduate credits attached. And there will be sustained support and a building upon each step of staff development.

The DCPS approach to staff development consists of five components: (1) required courses; (2) optional courses; (3) learner-initiated professional development projects; (4) distance learning; and (5) leadership training. Required courses examine the definition, principles, purpose, and implementation of performance-based education. Optional courses include workshops, institutes, and other in-service activities that teachers may select to enhance their skills and knowledge base. Learner-initiated professional development supports teachers' individual needs, based on their overall professional growth plan (see below).

Teacher Certification and Policies.

The Board of Education sets teacher education and certification policies, which were last revised in 1993. Upon successful completion of all preservice and exam requirements, entry-level teachers are issued a Standard Certificate, which is valid for five years. Since 1995, first-year teachers have been required to attend a 45-hour orientation program, entitled "New Teacher Seminar Series: Teaching for the 21st Century." The course is based on the five propositions advanced by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and provides teachers with information and strategies to organize age-appropriate environments and literacy programs in their classrooms. The course is co-sponsored by the DCPS and the Washington Teachers Union (WTU). Beginning teachers also receive support from consulting teachers (see below), who are assigned to assist all teachers, including in particular those at the novice level. In addition, principals are encouraged to assign experienced teachers as "buddies" to coach and guide new teachers.

After two years of satisfactory classroom experience, teachers are eligible for a five-year Professional Certificate. Renewal requirements for the Professional Certificate were introduced in 1980. Six semester hours are required

for renewal, which may be satisfied through enrollment in college/university credit courses, DCPS-sponsored in-service courses, or (upon prior approval) participation in conferences, seminars, or workshops offered by other providers both within and outside of the district. Teachers are required to implement individual professional growth plans based on the needs identified during their annual evaluations.

In 1994-95, the DCPS participated in the NBPTS Field Test Network, during which 11 teachers piloted the first set of National Board Certification assessments. As of June, 1996, however, no District of Columbia teachers were Board-certified.

State-Supported Programs. The Center for Systemic Educational Change (CSEC) is responsible for delivering DCPS-sponsored professional development. Managed by a deputy superintendent, the CSEC consists of four resource groups that provide consulting, facilitation, and brokering services in response to schools' needs.

The Organizational Culture/Human Resource Development and Training (OC/HRDT) Group oversees professional development programming for the district. OC/HRDT reviews all proposed in-service courses to ensure content quality and consistency with systemic initiatives. DCPS-sponsored professional development activities include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

- a required 45-hour course (equivalent to three in-service credits) entitled "Introduction to Performance-based Education" for teachers and administrators;
- courses based on the Urban Learner Framework, Dimensions of Learning, and the Responsive Classroom for K-3 and intermediate-grade teachers; and
- a Professional Development School at the secondary level that offers visiting Teacher Fellows a five-week intensive program to learn innovative instructional strategies, observe master teachers, and develop

teaching materials using the new curriculum frameworks.

Each year, the OC/HRDT publishes school-year and summer catalogues listing professional development opportunities offered by the district, the WTU, and other providers, such as the Kennedy Center and the Smithsonian Institute. These catalogues describe over 100 courses, workshops, seminars, institutes, and teleconferences. Courses are offered on both a fee and non-fee basis.

The CSEC's Curriculum Content, Instruction, and Assessment Group coordinates curriculum renewal activities and is staffed by teams of consultants with expertise in early, middle, and senior school learning environments. Started in 1990, the Early Childhood Professional Development team provides teacher institutes, collaborative forums, teacher cadres, demonstration sites, summer action labs, and consulting teachers. The Middle Learning Years Team is providing training to staff at three middle schools in the areas of interdisciplinary teaming, flexible scheduling, small learning communities, exploratory programs, and student-centered learning. At the high school level, five professional development schools are being established; visiting teachers will learn innovative instructional strategies and observe successful teachers.

In addition, elementary and secondary teachers apply for a special three-year appointment to the CSEC's Collegial Consultation Team initiative. "Consulting teachers" receive training from the district to provide peer coaching and staff development services to their assigned schools (usually three or four schools each) and assist with citywide staff development activities. Currently, there are 30 elementary and 20 secondary teachers serving in this capacity.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Mathematics, Science, and Technology Initiative (MSTI) was created in October of 1994 with the support of a \$13.5-million Urban Systemic Initiative grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). MSTI seeks to: (1) improve the scientific and mathematical literacy of all students; (2)

provide mathematics and science fundamentals that will enable students participate in a technological society; and (3) encourage minority students to pursue careers in mathematics, science, engineering, and technology. As a first step toward achieving these goals, MSTI sponsored a four-week summer institute in 1995 that was attended by 850 elementary teachers. MSTI activities are managed by the CSEC and receive technical support from George Washington University.

Goals 2000 funds are being used to support the district's school-based reform initiatives, such as enterprise schools, Renaissance 2000 schools, charter schools, and schools-within-schools. Schools that are interested in implementing one of these autonomy models are eligible to receive Goals 2000 subgrants. These funds are used to support a variety of school improvement activities, including professional development.

Public Funding for Professional Development

District Funds. The DCPS has a complex fiscal allocation process. In the area of professional development, this process begins with the CSEC, which submits a funding request and justification to the district's Budget Division. The request is reviewed, modified, and approved by the superintendent and the Board of Education. Additional review and approval is required from the mayor, the District Council, congressional budget committees, both houses of Congress, and the President of the United States. During the 1995-96 school year, the SEA allocated \$285,000 for professional development. However, nearly all of these funds were eliminated by budget cuts.

Federal Funds. With district funds for professional development at a minimum, federal programs such as Goals 2000, Eisenhower, Title I, Title VI, and Title VII provide the primary funding sources for professional development in the District of Columbia. During the 1995-96 year, the DCPS received a \$401,600 Goals 2000 grant and a \$1.5-million Eisenhower grant.

School Funds. The DCPS budget office distributes a portion of the central staff development fund directly to schools. In addition, some schools participate in special projects, such as public charter schools, enterprise schools, and Renaissance 2000 schools, which provide additional funding that may be used to support staff development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

A Local School Restructuring Team (LSRT) is established at each school and serves in an advisory role to the school's administration. The LSRTs are responsible for preparing and overseeing the implementation of an annual school improvement plan, and professional development is a required component of the plan. The district Office of Educational Accountability approves and monitors the plan. The official school-year calendar provides three citywide days that may be used for professional development or school record-keeping activities.

Schools rely on a variety of staff development providers, including district staff, universities, and outside consultants. A significant portion of staff development is provided by consulting teachers.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is not a collective bargaining issue for the District of Columbia's teachers. Salary increments may be earned for accumulating degrees and course credits according to the following scale: master's degree, master's plus 30 credits, master's plus 60 credits, and the doctorate.

There is no districtwide policy regarding tuition or expenses reimbursement related to professional development. Local schools have the option of providing such support. On occasion, the SEA may create incentives for certain categories of teachers—for example, mathematics and science teachers—to attend national conferences.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The CSEC works collaboratively with a number of area colleges and universities to design and implement professional development services for teachers. These partnerships include the following examples.

- The Professional Development Program for Teachers of Middle-Level Urban Learners is sponsored jointly by the SEA and the National-Louis University. Teachers earn 21 semester hours of graduate credit to receive a middle school endorsement certification. Thus far, 42 middle school teachers have completed the program thus far.
- Teachers interested in becoming educational leaders are able to participate in the Cooperative Outreach Principal Preparation Program, which is co-sponsored by the SEA and George Mason University. The first cohort of 25 teachers started classes in September of 1995 and will complete the program in the spring of 1997. A second cohort will begin classes in the fall of 1996.
- George Washington University and the DCPS are partners in the Professional Development Schools (PDS) project, which began during the 1994-95 school year. The PDS project targets secondary school teachers and allows them to conduct a five-week visit at a PDS site. While these "teacher fellows" are absent from their home schools, graduate students from George Mason University assume their classroom assignments as part of an internship program. Thus far, 75 teachers have completed this program.

Contacts/Information Resources

Maurice R. Sykes
Deputy Superintendent
Center for Systemic Educational Change
415 12th Street, NW, Room 805
Washington, DC 20004
202-724-4100

Roger J. Fish
Senior Associate
Organizational Culture/Human Resource
Development & Training
The Center for Systemic Educational
Change
Second and Peabody Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20011
202-576-6171

Barbara Bullock
President
Washington Teachers' Union
1717 K Street NW, Suite 902
Washington, DC 20005
202-293-8600

Publications and Reports

Center for Systemic Educational Change (CSEC). *A Design for Bringing Educational Services to Students - BESST*. District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. (August 1994).

CSEC. *Curriculum Renewal Handbook*. District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. (1994).

CSEC. *Catalogue of Systemwide Training Opportunities, SY 1995-96*. District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. (August 1995).

CSEC. *Catalogue of Systemwide Training Opportunities, Summer 1996*. District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. (August 1995).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Florida

Number of Teachers: 110,653**Average Years of Experience: 14****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 37%****Average Salary: \$31,944¹**

Education Policy Context

Florida is one of the fastest growing states in the nation, and its school districts are experiencing a steady influx of new students. During the 1996-97 school year, it is projected that more than 68,000 new students will enter Florida's schools, many of whom have limited English language skills. Of the 67 county school districts, 26 serve student populations greater than 20,000; in fact, Dade and Broward Counties are two of the largest school districts in the nation. A number of economic factors affect potential state funding sources for public education. Among these are the disappointing returns on a state lottery originally intended to enhance education, a large elderly population resistant to tax increases, an infrastructure strained by massive growth, and a high-risk, changing, growing, and mobile student population.

The state has played a lead role in school reform in Florida. Since 1970, there have been at least five comprehensive state reform initiatives. This was motivated in part by school funding reforms in the 1970s that made the state responsible for a large share of the costs of public education.

There is now a ground swell of support in Florida for the deregulation of schools that is motivated by the bottom line of accountability. In 1991, the

Florida legislature passed a School Improvement and Education Accountability Act. This legislation, which placed both responsibility and accountability for student success at the school level, focused on seven broad areas of reform: student readiness to start school, increased graduation rates, improved student performance, improved learning environments, increased school safety, better trained teachers and staff, and increased adult literacy. In 1996, an eighth area, increased parent involvement, was added.

The Sunshine State Standards were adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in May of 1996. These standards establish a clear set of expectations of what public school students in Florida should know and be able to accomplish at specified grade levels. The Standards were developed by the state Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) at four levels—grades PK-2, grades 3-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-12—in the subject areas of language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, health and physical education, and foreign languages.

Based on the Sunshine State Standards, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) is being developed to measure student learning in the areas of reading and mathematics. Statewide administration of the FCAT

will begin in the spring of 1998; it will be taken by all students at three times during their school careers: at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The *Florida Writes* test, which assesses writing proficiency, and the High School Competency Tests, which are required for graduation, will continue to be administered. Schools that produce inadequate test results will receive intensive, specialized assistance to raise student achievement to acceptable levels.

The State Role in Professional Development

The School Community Professional Development Act, enacted by the legislature in 1995, replaced the Teacher Education Center Act and became the foundation for Florida's new professional development system. The new professional development model establishes collaborative partnerships among the SEA, colleges and universities, school districts, individual schools, and consortiums to promote joint responsibility and coordination across institutions.

Professional development is broadly defined in Florida to encompass many models and various delivery systems, such as training, mentoring, coaching, distance learning, professional education, research, academies, and regional

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

centers. Professional development activities, as identified in site-based school improvement plans, are supposed to address the needs of students and schools and to improve educator performance to increase student learning. During the 1996-97 school year, the SEA will be conducting an evaluation of professional development initiatives throughout the state. It will submit a final report to the legislature and governor in September of 1997.

The Education Standards Commission (ESC) has been in existence since 1980 and serves the SBE in an advisory capacity on matters pertaining to teacher preparation, certification, professional development, and performance evaluation. Its membership is comprised of 12 teachers, one school principal, one superintendent, one staff development director, four citizens, two deans of colleges/departments of education, one representative of an independent institution, and one representative of a community college.

The ESC has identified *Educator Accomplished Practices*, which represent the standards of knowledge, skills, and dispositions in 12 areas that teachers need to obtain in order to practice effectively. These standards represent a high level of teacher proficiency, based on a continuous quality improvement model that begins with preservice teacher preparation and continues through the educator's professional career, with the ultimate intention of promoting greater student achievement. The *Practices* were distributed to all 67 Florida school district superintendents for their review. The SBE is expected to implement the work of the ESC in the near future. The ESC is in the process of identifying teacher subject-area competencies that are based on the student subject-area competencies defined in the Sunshine State Standards.

Teacher Certification Policies. Beginning teachers are issued a non-renewable, two-year Temporary Certificate. Legislation passed in 1982 created the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, which was revamped in 1990 as the Professional Orientation Program (POP) for Beginning Teachers. POP is a required, one-year program for all begin-

ning teachers. Local districts are responsible for designing and implementing POP activities in accordance with state guidelines. The guidelines specify that each beginning teacher should be assigned a support team (comprised of the principal, a peer teacher, and one additional professional educator) that provides guidance and monitoring. The support team is expected to use a clinical supervision model of pre-conferencing, observing, and post-conferencing, which culminates in a summative observation. Most districts use the state-developed and state-validated Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS), which can be used both as a formative and summative evaluation instrument. The SEA has prepared and maintained a FPMS Certified Trainer Cadre of approximately 200 school-, district-, and university-based educators statewide. To date, 12,000 individuals have been trained by the cadre as "Approved FPMS Observers."

After completing the POP, passing the required certification tests, and completing any additional certification requirements, a teacher is eligible to receive the Professional Certificate, which must be renewed every five years by obtaining either six college credits or 120 in-service points. Certificate renewal is handled at the local level for district-employed educators.

Currently, Florida's entire certification and recertification process, as well as the POP, is being re-examined. In the fall of 1995, the Commissioner appointed three task forces to examine all components of educator professionalism and to consider how to increase accountability and standards for teachers and administrators in Florida. The three task forces—Educator Preparation and Certification, Educator Contracts and Performance, and Educator Standards of Conduct and Practice—met intermittently throughout the 1995-96 school year and were comprised of teachers, school administrators, teacher association and union representatives, legislators, and business and community representatives.

Task force recommendations address areas of reform such as professional contracts, probationary employ-

ment, fingerprinting of all school district employees, self-reporting by educators of current felony charges, and the revamping of the teacher certification system, including the recognition of National Board Certification. The recommendations have been presented to the Commissioner and will serve as a framework for developing legislative initiatives for the spring of 1997 session.

State-Supported Programs. The state supports two major professional development models, the Area Centers for Educational Enhancement and the Florida Academies for Excellence in Teaching. These Centers and Academies represent partnerships between school districts and colleges and universities that serve as principle delivery systems for statewide professional development in the implementation of standards, new curriculum frameworks, and assessment strategies.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Goals 2000 funds were awarded to local districts on a competitive basis to support innovative programs, curriculum development, school restructuring, and strategic professional development initiatives. One particularly innovative project, the Teacher Education Alliance, is a collaboration among Broward County schools, the local community college, and a local university to establish an urban professional development center that provides preservice and in-service training to teachers.

Almost every national restructuring group is actively involved in an educational reform effort in Florida and provides additional resources for professional development. For example, Dade and Broward Counties are involved with the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), and IBM has awarded a Reinventing Education grant to Broward County. An Annenberg Foundation Challenge Grant is funding a joint project with three southern Florida districts: Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties. Dade County has received an Urban Systemic Initiative (USI) grant from the National Science Foundation. Florida also received Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) funds from the National Science Foundation in 1991, but funding was withdrawn in 1996.

Florida receives more than \$140 million annually in federal funds under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), of which 22 percent is used to support services for students with disabilities. Several professional development services are provided through IDEA funds, including the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resource System (FDLRS), the Multiagency Service Network, and the Severely Emotionally Disturbed Students Program, as well as special projects such as the Florida Inclusion Network, the Institute for Integrated Services, and the Institute for Small and Rural Districts.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. State professional development funds are allocated to school districts as a percentage of their base allocation per full-time equivalent (FTE) student, which is a fairly constant amount of approximately \$6.00. A portion of these funds must be used to conduct POP activities. The Area Centers for Educational Enhancement and the Florida Academies for Excellence in Teaching are funded with more than \$4 million per year.

Federal Funds. In 1996-97, Florida received approximately \$5,364,572 through Goals 2000 for staff development; it also received \$8,793,528 in Eisenhower K-12 Mathematics and Science funds and \$1,861,064 in Eisenhower Higher Education Mathematics and Science funds to support professional development. It is estimated that \$7 million in IDEA funds were used to provide professional development during the 1995-96 school year. Other federal sources used to support teacher training include Safe and Drug Free School funds (\$200,000) and Comprehensive School Health Education funds (\$309,644).

Local Funds. School districts may allocate no less than \$4 and no more than \$9.50 per unweighted FTE of funds garnered through the Florida Lottery for professional development activities related to their school improvement plans.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

All school districts and many private school organizations have approved comprehensive master in-service plans for the professional development of all employees. In the past, the SEA approved all in-service plans developed by the local district. The current system provides school districts greater flexibility by giving local school boards responsibility for the review and approval of district master in-service plans. The master plan must be based on an assessment of training needs conducted by a committee that includes parents, teachers, and other educational personnel. The plan must contain staff development activities that reflect the needs identified in the school improvement plans. Each school's improvement plan is designed by a school advisory council and must be approved by the district school board.

The official school-year calendar consists of 196 days, of which 16 may be used for non-teaching activities (e.g., parent conference days, and record-keeping, etc.). Officials report that, typically, local bargaining agreements specify between four and six days per year for professional development.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Bargaining for compensation for professional development is a permissive area in Florida. Reimbursement policies vary from district to district. Some districts reimburse teachers for college courses, award salary increments for accumulated continuing education units, provide paid teacher sabbaticals, pay stipends for training days, or offer release time for professional development activities. Some districts have been creative in using flex time and substitute teachers to enable individual teachers or teacher teams to receive training or engage in other professional development activities during the school day.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Teacher associations have historically offered training in various state and local initiatives. The extent to which they are key providers of professional development appears to vary widely from district to district.

Heavy support from foundations and other outside organizations is the norm in many Florida districts. Because of rapid growth in both student population and the number of businesses in the state, Florida has become an educational laboratory of sorts. Businesses and other organizations provide many training opportunities to teachers and other educators.

Contacts/Information Resources

Bob Bedford
Deputy Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
Capitol Building, Room PL-08
Tallahassee, FL 32399
904-413-0555

Betty Cox
Director
Human Resource Development
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 203
904-487-3663

Suzanne Kinzer
Teacher Education Alliance
Florida Atlantic University
600 SE Third Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
305-760-7344

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Georgia

Number of Teachers: 75,602**Average Years of Experience: 13****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%****Average Salary: \$29,214¹**

Education Policy Context

Georgia serves over 1.2 million students in its 181 public school districts. Georgia's State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) has recently been restructured to promote increased decision making in local schools. The state's education priorities include scaling back bureaucracy and regulations to increase school autonomy in setting educational goals and determining operational structure. Georgia promotes a "back to basics" educational philosophy that emphasizes early childhood education, student incentives for higher education, flexibility in textbook adoption, and the use of technology. Graduation credentials have been narrowed to two options—a college-prep or vocational diploma—to reflect the state's focus on high school articulation to careers and postsecondary education. The general diploma has been eliminated.

In 1985, Georgia's legislature passed a comprehensive education reform package, the Quality Basic Education (QBE) Act. QBE mandates staff development for all school personnel, including school board members and non-certified staff. Under the QBE Act, the state funding formula supports the implementation of districts' comprehensive staff development plans, which are submitted to the State Board of Education (SBE) for

review and approval. Prior to the passing of the QBE Act, only those districts that requested state monies were required to design and submit an annual staff development plan. All districts must now submit an annual staff development plan that reflects the needs of local personnel in the following areas: the induction of beginning teachers; needs identified during personnel evaluations; needs identified during evaluation of instructional programs; and other needs identified by the districts or prescribed by the SBE. Georgia's Comprehensive Staff Development Program is a mandated, state-funded system that addresses professional development needs identified at the district and school levels.

Recent reform efforts—such as the Schools for the Future Program initiated by the Georgia Board of Education in 1991, the Charter Schools Program initiated by Georgia's legislature in 1993, and the Next Generation Schools Project initiated by the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education in 1993—represent broad commitments of state-level resources to support school-based restructuring. (The Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education is a state-level collaborative of business, government, and education leaders. Formed in 1990, the Partnership promotes quality public education in Georgia.) To assist local systems with restructuring, the SEA and Regional Education Service

Agencies (RESAs) initiated a major effort in 1995 to provide on-demand, customized technical assistance. Assistance is available regarding school restructuring and improvement, needs assessment, and instructional technology, as well as in other areas.

The State Role in Professional Development

Georgia has long played a supportive role in teacher development and has, for many years, provided grants to districts to reimburse teachers for college tuition. In 1973, the SBE approved a "State Plan for Staff Development," which encouraged districts to plan and implement their own staff development programs. The state plan linked teacher recertification to the accumulation of staff development units (SDUs) or college credit hours that could be earned through participation in professional development activities offered by districts and other agencies. In addition, Georgia is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. In 1991, Georgia's legislature passed a bill (HB 589) that transferred authority for teacher preparation and licensure from

the SBE to an autonomous state agency known as the Professional Standard Commission (PSC). The Commission is comprised of 28 members representing P-12 education, institutions of higher education, health and human services, the corporate sector, and the community; by statute, nine PSC members are classroom teachers. In 1994, the PSC amended state requirements for teacher and administrator certification programs.

Georgia teachers are issued a Clear Renewal Certificate upon successful completion of preservice requirements. This certification is renewable every five years by earning ten quarter hours of college credit or Georgia staff development credits and by posting a satisfactory score on a PSC-authorized subject-matter test. Teachers may earn SDUs through participation in district-sponsored staff development activities. One SDU is awarded for every 10 contact hours of instruction. Since 1990, many beginning teachers (i.e., teachers with less than three years of experience) have had the opportunity to participate in locally designed induction programs. State-trained mentors provide guidance to beginning teachers.

Georgia encourages its teachers to apply for National Board Certification and to participate in examination preparation programs by paying their examination fees and providing a salary increase for those who successfully achieve Board certification.

Districts are required to conduct an annual teacher performance evaluation process; however, the results of teacher evaluations do not affect recertification. Districts have the option of evaluating teachers using the state-designed Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) or a different evaluation instrument. Regardless of the chosen method, personnel needs identified through the evaluation process must be incorporated into districts' staff development plans.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA oversees the Georgia Education Leadership Academy, which was created by the QBE Act of 1985. The Academy conducts seminars, symposia, special workshops, and summer institutes throughout the state on topics such as personnel assessment and evaluation,

leadership development, technology planning and utilization, management skills, information dissemination, and school improvement activities. The Academy's Staff Development Unit serves as the central source of information and expertise for district- and school-level educators, who may use its resources to learn about research issues, trends, and effective practice in professional development. These structures enable the SEA to provide resource materials, technical assistance, and training services to assist local districts in carrying out their staff development plans.

The SEA also sponsors Technology Training Centers, which are operated in collaboration with colleges, universities, and the RESAs. Each Center conducts a Technology Leadership Institute, which provides 37 full-day courses designed to meet the needs of technology specialists at the district level. Many other school personnel have received training in technology at these Centers. Customized on-site training and distance learning are also available.

Through its Teacher Support Specialist and Induction Mentor Teacher programs, the SEA trains experienced classroom teachers to become mentors and/or supervisors for student interns and beginning teachers. Applicants for these programs must have a minimum of three years of teaching experience, supply two recommendations (one from a principal), and show evidence of professional competency. Teachers earn ten SDUs upon program completion. Other professional development programs offered through the SEA include the Superintendent Professional Development Program, the Next Generation School Project Leadership Team Development Program, the Governor's School Leadership Institute, the New Leaders Institute, the New Superintendent Orientation Program, and Education's Leadership Georgia.

Georgia law has established 16 RESAs to provide support services (including staff development) that respond to the needs of school districts. Each RESA is governed by a board representing local school board members within its service area. RESAs are

required to provide services in research and planning, staff development, curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, electronic technology, and alcohol and drug abuse instruction. Other services provided by RESAs are determined through local needs assessments. Currently, RESAs serve approximately 175 of the 180 school districts in the state. RESAs receive funding from the state, as well as through fees collected from participating schools districts, competitive grants, and federal programs.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Georgia Initiative in Mathematics and Science (GIMS) was created in 1993 through a Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation. GIMS activities, managed by the University of Georgia's Science Education Department, focus primarily on improving middle-grade (4-8) mathematics and science education, but include all grades, K-12. The program is coordinated through nine regional GIMS Centers, which utilize a professional development school (PDS) model to partner higher education institutions with middle schools across the state. The Centers promote collegial discourse among university faculty and classroom teachers to research, design, and implement reforms related to curriculum and instruction, student assessment, systems change, and diversity. Focus Teams representing each Center meet quarterly for cross-site information sharing, progress reporting, and discussing scaling up and other implementation issues.

Georgia has received a Goals 2000 grant, a portion of which has been allocated to support professional development. During the 1995-96 school year, 26 local school systems received funds for professional development as part of their Goals 2000 programs.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Since 1987, the state has provided a cost-of-instruction (COI) allocation to districts each year to support staff development programs. COI allocations are calculated as the

equivalent of .5 percent of all professional salaries in the district. These funds can be used to pay for release time (i.e., substitute teacher salaries), travel to conferences and workshops, trainer and consultant fees, materials, equipment used for staff development activities, and reimbursement to teachers for registration fees, course tuition, or textbooks. The total amount of COI allocations for FY 1994 was \$6,375,450; the FY 1995 budget increased to \$6,977,959.

Since 1988, Georgia's legislature has appropriated annual funds for Professional Development Stipends (PDS). In FY 1994, the allocation was \$21,980,497; in FY 1995, it increased to \$22,652,623. Districts may award stipends to individuals who successfully complete an approved staff development activity that focuses on the skills development areas identified through a needs assessment process. Stipends may only be awarded for staff development activities that relate directly to school and/or district educational programs.

The basic state grant for the RESAs was \$9.7 million for the 1996-97 school year. The SEA also allocates funds to provide stipends to teachers who mentor beginning teachers. This allocation totaled \$1.25 million in 1994-95 and will remain constant through FY 1997.

Federal Funds. During the 1995-96 school year, Georgia received a \$6.2-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant and an \$8.9-million Goals 2000 grant (a portion of which was allocated for professional development subgrants to districts). GIMS activities are funded primarily by a five-year, \$10-million grant from the National Science Foundation.

Local Funds. Districts are allowed unlimited transfer of monies between COI and PDS allocations. No more than 10 percent of these funds may be used for administration costs related to the delivery of staff development activities.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Under the QBE Act, districts are required to develop and submit staff

development plans. These plans are largely based on the needs identified in the annual personnel evaluation process, but they may also reflect emerging interests in new education practices. Staff development plans are submitted annually and must be approved by the SEA before funds are released. Districts are also required to submit an end-of-year report that describes the staff development activities conducted, the number and types of participants, and an evaluative summary of the impact and outcomes of their staff development programs. Every five years, the SEA conducts on-site compliance monitoring of district staff development plans.

Districts must designate a staff development coordinator, who is responsible for creating an inclusive process of planning, implementation, and evaluation of staff development. In smaller districts, this role may be one of several responsibilities assigned to a central administrator, while, in larger districts, a person may be hired solely for this purpose. Districts may use one or more of ten "local use workdays" that are built into the school-year calendar for non-classroom-based activities. There is no minimum number of days required by law specifically for staff development.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

There is no collective bargaining in Georgia. Teachers' salaries are based on a state salary scale, which awards step increases based on years of experience and advanced degrees earned. Individual districts may augment these increases, and some suburban and large urban districts do. Georgia teachers who achieve National Board Certification receive a one-time, 5 percent salary bonus. The state also reimburses National Board certified teachers for the cost of undergoing National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) assessments.

COI funds may be used to reimburse teachers for expenses incurred as a result of their participation in staff development activities, such as conference registration fees, course tuition, and textbooks. PDS funds are made available

to teachers who successfully complete accredited college or SDU courses. Stipends are awarded at a rate not to exceed \$150 per quarter hour of college credit or equivalent SDU credit. Teachers who receive PDS monies are not eligible to apply for tuition reimbursement. COI and PDS funds may not be used when coursework is undertaken for the primary purpose of obtaining an advanced degree.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The College of Education at the University of Georgia established a League of Professional Schools in 1989 as part of its Program for School Improvement (PSI) initiative. The League of Professional Schools involves 105 schools in Georgia, engaging them in a change process that "promotes the school as a democratic learning community that is student-oriented and focused on improving teaching and learning for all." In order to join the League, 80 percent of a school's staff must agree to engage in the process, after which the University provides assistance in establishing a shared decision-making structure, planning instructional initiatives, conducting a school needs assessment, and formulating structures for continued dialogue and collegial planning. The League also provides a newsletter, cross-site meetings, an Action Research Consortium, and an information retrieval system that includes the latest research on school improvement issues.

The Georgia Staff Development Council (GSDC) was created in 1986 to promote professional development for Georgia's educators by providing leadership, disseminating research on effective practices, and serving as a state network for educators to share information on staff development issues. The Council conducts conferences in the fall and spring, provides technical assistance services, sponsors a recognition program for staff developers, disseminates resource materials, and produces *Update*, a quarterly newsletter.

The Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium (GVSDC) is an association of member school districts organized for the purpose of providing approved staff development opportunities for the state's vocational educators. All districts are eligible to join the GVSDC by paying a membership fee based on a percentage of their Carl Perkins Vocational Basic Grant Allocations. Courses offered include administration, agriculture, applied mathematics, communication, biology/chemistry, business and marketing, family and consumer sciences, special needs, technology, and trade and industrial sciences. Teachers and other educators from member districts may participate in GVSDC courses at no cost. Non-member district teachers may also participate for a minimal fee. All courses offered by the Consortium are eligible for SDU credit.

Contacts/Information Resources

Margaret M. Torrey
Executive Secretary
Georgia Professional Standards
Commission
1454 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-657-9006

J. Fulton Stone
Director of Staff Development
Georgia Department of Education
1866 Twin Towers East
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-656-2433

Carl Glickman
League of Professional Schools
Department of Teacher Education
University of Georgia
124 Aderhold Hall
Athens, GA 30602
706-542-2516

Publications and Reports

Georgia Staff Development Program.
Georgia Department of Education (FY 1994).

Resource Guide for Staff Development.
Georgia Department of Education (1993).

School Focused Staff Development Guide. Georgia Department of Education (June 1990).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Hawaii

Number of Teachers: 10,111
Average Years of Experience: 15
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 22%
Average Salary: \$38,584¹

Education Policy Context

Hawaii is a small state serving approximately 180,430 students in its public education system of 240 schools within one state "district." The schools are organized into seven geographic administrative units, which are referred to as districts in Hawaii (throughout this document, the term "district" refers to an intermediate administrative unit). Hawaii has a statewide school system with one Board of Education. Funding for local schools is allocated by the state legislature, and all school personnel are state employees.

Under its education reform agenda, the state delegated much of its authority to the schools. The 1989 School Community-Based Management law moved decision-making authority regarding curriculum, instruction, and administrative and assessment policies to the schools. Subsequently, a lump-sum budgeting law decentralized budget authority to the schools. Schools are funded based on a weighted per-pupil allocation; they have limited flexibility and control over how funds are spent for instruction and other programs.

Hawaii recently faced a budget deficit that, in conjunction with the new lump-sum budgeting law, resulted in large cuts to the Hawaii Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). The statewide system of resource teams,

previously available in each school district to provide on-site professional development, was eliminated. The budget cuts reduced the SEA's ability to deliver in-service activities and technical assistance to local schools.

The Board of Education approved a downsizing and restructuring plan for the SEA effective in FY 1996-97. The plan provides essential services to schools through the "RAPID" (Responsive, Accessible, Performance-driven, Integrated, and Direct) initiative. RAPID services are carried out through centralized budget, business, personnel, technological, and decentralized instructional support services. The SEA is working with the district superintendents and deputies to establish new roles and responsibilities for district leaders, including further decentralization of their supervisory relationships with school principals. Most professional development policies are set at the school level.

State initiatives to develop performance standards for students and to restructure student assessment have significant implications for the classroom. For example, new curriculum guidelines have yet to be distributed, yet school staff are preparing new curricula to help students perform well on the new state assessments.

The State Role in Professional Development

While the state is devolving many management responsibilities to the local level, some state-level initiatives are having an impact on teacher professional development.

The Hawaii Teachers Standards Board (HTSB) was established by the legislature in July of 1995 to help the teaching profession attain a status comparable to that of other professions, to ensure that all children have "qualified" teachers, and to regain public confidence in teachers. The HTSB has statutory authority to set licensing and credentialing standards for teachers, to review and revise those standards, to set fees for recertification, and to determine penalties. The HTSB operates autonomously, although the SEA is still responsible for processing the paper work associated with teacher certification.

Teacher Certification Policies. Hawaii's budget difficulties have had a significant impact on the certification and recertification of teachers. Previously, state funds provided support for new teachers through mentoring and training; however, funding has been passed directly to the schools, which now have the option of providing support services to new teachers. There are no recertification requirements at this

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

time, although a new assessment process for teachers and administrators is being studied and the HTSB is expected to establish a recertification policy for educators.

State-Supported Programs. Two SEA offices play roles in teacher professional development. The Office of Personnel Services provides a comprehensive personnel program for certified and classified employees of the public school system, and oversees the renewal of teaching licenses. The Office of Instructional Services develops and provides staff development for new programs and services, and provides technical assistance, coordination, and support for statewide curricular and instructional programs and activities.

The SEA literacy project, the Success Compact, offers state-sponsored professional development activities to schools. "Master teachers" are trained in implementing the Success Compact in their own schools, then used to help establish the program in others. Local schools pay for master-teacher services, and the SEA operating budget pays for some training costs. Schools that adopt the Success Compact receive in-service days for staff development activities.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The state has used Goals 2000 to help support its comprehensive educational reform effort and to support local school reform.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Prior to the budget crisis, there had been a state line item for professional development of \$2.5 million. There is no longer a separate line item in the state's education budget for professional development. However, because the state fully funds education, the state funds any professional development budgeted by schools. There are no state regulations regarding local spending on professional development. Decisions about spending on professional development are now made at the local level.

The SEA proposed \$3.4-million in new initiatives for FY 1996-97, including \$808,000 for developing a comprehensive assessment and accountability

system to evaluate student and staff performance, and \$1.2 million for ten resource teachers to provide staff development, substitute teacher funds to release master teachers, and general support for 30 new Success Compact schools.

Federal Funds. The state receives Goals 2000, Eisenhower, and Title 1 funds that support professional development activities. Goals 2000 funding for Year 2 totaled \$1,381,641, ninety percent of which went to local districts for projects to improve student achievement. The remaining ten percent was used by the state for its education reform plan. Hawaii received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funds in FY 1995.

Local Funds. The state does not require districts or schools to allocate a specific portion of their budgets for staff development. Professional development spending varies from school to school, and district to district.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The state requires districts and schools to design improvement plans which include provisions for staff development. Schools develop their own plans based on the direction set by the state and district superintendents. District improvement plans are based on the needs and goals outlined in the individual school improvement plans, with a focus on supporting schools in meeting the district goals. District superintendents monitor school improvement plans by meeting with principals to discuss what has been accomplished in their individual schools. The district superintendent is appointed and evaluated (based on district performance) by the state superintendent.

Participation in school community-based management (SCBM) is currently voluntary and open to all public schools in Hawaii, but all public schools will eventually participate. As a part of SCBM, schools submit directly to the state proposals that include school improvement plans and requests for staff development support.

The SEA restructuring deployed 35 state and district curriculum specialists as school renewal specialists (SRSs). The SRSs assist in the school renewal process by providing leadership, planning, and coordination of support services to schools. They help schools implement Performance Standards and the Success Compact. The SRSs are employed by the district but work closely with school principals.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

All teachers in Hawaii are governed by one state contract. The Hawaii State Teachers Association (HSTA) has been active in seeking professional development opportunities for its members. One priority has been providing teachers with time needed to plan and pursue professional development activities. Another issue is the accessibility and/or delivery of professional development to HSTA members on neighboring islands which are difficult to access.

Teachers are sometimes reimbursed for professional development costs, but school policies vary. They receive salary increments for accumulating college coursework: 30 credits after a bachelor's degree warrants a step increase. Teachers are currently evaluated on a two-year cycle. However, the SEA is reviewing the teacher evaluation process and investigating performance-based teacher evaluation.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The HSTA provides numerous workshops and other professional development services to its members. It holds institutes on topics such as inclusion, discipline, scheduling, human-relations, team-building, and decision-making. HSTA provides staff, upon request, to work with their members in districts or schools. Teacher organizations, such as content-related teacher organizations, other than HSTA also provide professional development.

Higher education is the largest source of professional development for teachers in Hawaii. The SEA works with state institutions of higher education to coordinate and plan professional development. The University of Hawaii works directly with some school districts.

The private sector also provides professional development. For example, Chevron offers development opportunities for science teachers working in school districts where the company has refineries.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Contacts/Information Resources

Leighton Hirai
Personnel Specialist
Office of Personnel Services
Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, HI 96804
808-586-3280

Arlene Lee Williams
Instruction and Professional Development Specialist
Hawaii Teachers Standards Board
Hawaii State Teachers Association
2828 Paa Street, Room 2050
Honolulu, HI 96817
808-833-2711

Clara Burrows
Office of Personnel Services
Department of Education
P.O. Box 2360
Honolulu, HI 96804
808-586-3280

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Idaho

Number of Teachers: 12,007**Average Years of Experience: 13****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 22%****Average Salary: \$27,756¹**

Education Policy Context

Idaho is a very remote and rural state with a small student population. In 1993, 236,774 students were enrolled in Idaho's public schools. However, this represents a substantial increase in enrollment over the past decade. There are many small school districts in the state, some of which have fewer than 300 students. Idaho's school districts have a great deal of local control over the setting of education policy, and many decisions affecting teacher professional development take place in school and district offices.

After the election of a new state superintendent in January of 1995, state-level education policy in Idaho began to change significantly. A new testing program for students has been implemented under the direction of Superintendent Anne Fox, who also intends to draft new curriculum frameworks with a more "back to basics" approach. Idaho has not adopted content standards. However, the first drafts of its new curriculum guides were released in 1996. In July of 1995, the Idaho Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) revised the standards for the certification of school personnel.

The State Role in Professional Development

The Professional Standards Commission (PSC) serves in an advisory role to the State Board of Education. The PSC is responsible for setting standards for teacher licensure, and is currently reworking teacher preservice standards.

However, most professional development planning takes place at the district level. Each district is required to create a professional development plan. The state distributes a professional development handbook to districts to guide the design and implementation of professional development plans. The handbook was created by the State Inservice Advisory Committee and the PSC in 1984. It lists the recertification requirements (which were established in 1984) and outlines expected roles and responsibilities of the state and of districts in providing professional development for teachers. While the state handbook indicates that the SEA will collect and review district plans through an approval and accreditation process, there are reportedly no penalties for districts if they fail to comply with this requirement.

Teacher Certification Policies.

Regular Idaho teaching credentials are issued for a five-year period for both initial and continuing teachers. There is a professional development requirement; teachers must earn six semester hours or their equivalent within this five-year period. Of these six semester hours, at least three must represent university or college credit. No more than three hours of approved in-service can be applied toward recertification. Teachers are encouraged by the SEA to develop individual professional growth plans. An advanced teaching certificate is available and requires a master's degree in either a specific content area or in curriculum and instruction and three years of teaching experience.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA does provide some professional development opportunities for Idaho teachers. Every first Thursday and Friday in October is reserved for state in-service activities. However, it is not mandatory for districts to set aside these days. Professional development policy falls under the domain of the state Office of Teacher Certification.

The only new state initiatives regarding professional development for educators are related to technology. The state legislature has been allocating

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

funds for schools to upgrade their technological capacity—dedicating approximately \$10.4 million from 1994 to 1996 alone to support this effort. A portion of those funds have been used to support professional development for teachers.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. In 1995, Idaho received both Goals 2000 and Eisenhower funding. The \$1.2-million Eisenhower grant helped to support professional development programs in the state.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state's budget for professional development. The SEA does provide some technical assistance and some in-service activities for teachers, although it is unknown what amount is spent on these activities. At one time, the state funded a mentor program for new teachers, but it was subsequently cut from the budget.

Federal Funds. Idaho received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funding in FY 1995 to help support professional development activities. Idaho received \$450,000 in Goals 2000 funding in Year 1.

Local Funds. Districts and teachers directly pay for the major portion of their professional development costs. In order to provide salary increments for teachers who pursue professional development, state aid is funneled to school districts based on the number of course credits that its teachers earn.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

As mentioned above, every school district is required to forward a districtwide professional development plan to the SEA. These plans are to be based on a template provided by the agency. Districts are also expected to establish professional development committees (comprised of teachers, non-

certificated staff, community members, and administrators), to conduct a needs assessment each year, and to develop priority areas for their professional development plans. There is no state money available for developing or implementing the plans and also no penalty for the failure to comply with this requirement. There is no state requirement that districts set aside funds for professional development, nor is there a mandated minimum number of professional development days.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Collective bargaining in Idaho only impacts professional development at the local level. Teachers usually pay for most of their professional development expenses. They can earn salary increments for up to 15 semester hours of coursework.

By law, teachers must be evaluated twice each year for the first three years of employment. After three years, they must be evaluated once each year. This evaluation is not linked to recertification.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Idaho Education Association (IEA) has been active at both the state and local levels in addressing the issue of professional growth opportunities for its members. They have worked with the PSC to help develop priorities in this area, and, on the local level, they sponsor local professional development committees that work with districts. These local committees represent teachers, collect information about professional development needs, and help teachers identify their own resources and opportunities. At the state level, the IEA developed and published a document, called "Visions of Change," that outlines the IEA's vision for the future of education in Idaho. In terms of professional development, the document calls for a mentoring system for new teachers, more time for teachers to

collaborate and pursue professional development, higher salaries for educators, more high-quality in-service activities, and in-school time scheduled for collaboration and planning with other teachers. In addition, the state's subject-matter teacher organizations offer some professional development opportunities for their members.

Given the college coursework requirement for recertification, higher education institutions are one of the largest providers of professional development for Idaho's teachers. Higher education institutions also work with local districts to provide on-site professional development for teachers.

Foundations and businesses—such as US West, an Idaho phone service provider that awards grants to "innovative" teachers—also provide support for professional development for Idaho's educators.

Contacts/Information Resources

Roger Hanshaw
Supervisor of Teacher Certification
Teacher Certification and Professional Standards
Idaho Department of Education
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0027
208-332-6800

Bob Knoespel
Idaho Professional Standards Board
Mount View Middle School
645 Mitchell Lane
Blackfoot, ID 83221
208-785-8820

Jim Shackelford
Executive Director
Idaho Education Association
P.O. Box 2638
Boise, ID 83701
208-336-6967

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Illinois

Number of Teachers: 110,874**Average Years of Experience: 16****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 46%****Average Salary: \$39,416¹**

Education Policy Context

Illinois enrolls 943,623 students in its public school system, which is organized into 906 districts. As in many states, there is some tension in Illinois between the tradition of local control over education policy and the desire to establish a vision and set policy at the state level. The Illinois State Board of Education serves as the state's education agency (SEA). The Governor appoints the members of the Board, and they appoint the Superintendent.

Superintendent Joseph Spagnolo issued a Quality Schools Initiative (QSI) concept paper that was adopted by the SEA in August of 1995. Intended to initiate a dialogue about education improvement and reform in Illinois, the QSI calls for the development of standards for students and for the teacher professional development necessary to support those standards. A new student assessment system is being developed and is expected to be in place by 1999.

The Superintendent recently reorganized the SEA into a system of six Centers for Educational Leadership, reporting to a central Leadership Team in the SEA. The Center for Accountability and Quality Assurance oversees the state's professional development policies. The Center has five divisions: Professional Preparation; Change and Innovation; Learning, Standards, and

Assessment; Quality Review and School Improvement Planning; and Policies and Practices. The Project Team for Professional Development in the SEA also focuses on professional development for educators.

The State Role in Professional Development

As a part of its general mission statement, the SEA has outlined a series of goals for improving education for all Illinois students. Ensuring a qualified workforce of educators is the sixth goal:

All Illinois public school students will have access to schools and classrooms with highly qualified and effective professionals who ensure that students achieve high levels of learning.

The SEA Project Team for Professional Development and relevant subcommittees have been working to establish a vision for ongoing teacher professional development. The Project Team is creating a professional development action plan for the state. An "idea paper" on professional development, which served as the impetus for the creation of this Project Team, outlines a plan for bringing together relevant stakeholders to develop a professional development strategy in Illinois. A research effort is underway to design the

most appropriate plan for implementation. The Professional Development Project Team organized a three-day "search conference" and conducted focus groups to help develop a proposal.

In 1996, the SEA created a task force which received a grant from the Joyce Foundation to study and make recommendations regarding a new system of initial certification. In August of 1996, the task force presented its recommendations for revising teacher certification and recertification. Recommended was a requirement that teachers participate in professional development to renew their certificates.

The recommendations from the Project Team and the task force were studied and combined into one document, "Illinois Framework for Restructuring the Recruitment, Preparation, Licensure and Continuing Professional Development of Teachers." Adopted by the SBE in November of 1996, the "Framework" recommended:

Professional Standards. Illinois should adopt professional standards that clearly indicate what teachers are expected to know and be able to do. Standards should include those of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC).

Teacher Preparation Programs. The design of teacher preparation programs should be based on identified teacher standards. Course-based requirements should be eliminated. Teacher

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

preparation programs should include comprehensive clinical experiences.

New Teacher Induction. Beginning teachers should be provided the support and guidance needed to effectively deal with the challenges of their new responsibilities. Standards for new teacher induction programs should be developed and every school in Illinois should implement a program for new teachers.

State Licensure/Certification System. A three-tiered system of licensure should be developed which includes an initial license, a standard license, and an advanced certificate. The levels of the teacher licenses should reflect what teachers need to know and be able to do at various grade levels and in specific subject or teaching areas.

Continuing Professional Development. Professional development should be required for renewal of licenses. Funding and other support should be provided to local schools to promote the development of learning communities. The state should foster new resources for professional development, such as teacher academies and school-university partnerships.

School Cultures. Local schools should be encouraged to develop a shared vision of what they hope their schools will become and work toward that vision. Schools should structure their instructional day in ways which promote collaboration and mutual support.

Recruitment. The state, in partnership with Illinois business and education communities, should develop an aggressive, well-coordinated and creative plan for recruiting talented individuals into the profession.

Many of "Framework" recommendations will require legislative action which will be sought in an upcoming legislative session. The SEA will convene advisory groups to detail each recommendation. The advisory groups are expected to make additional recommendations in September 1997.

Illinois is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, allowing Illinois to implement pilot projects which correspond to the recommendations in the

"Framework" and the National Commission's report, "What Matters Most: Teaching and America's Future."

These pilot projects include a program to allow new teachers in the Chicago Public School System to pilot test a performance-based portfolio assessment in cooperation with INTASC. New teachers will develop portfolios using INTASC guidelines and will be mentored by experienced teachers who hold advanced certificates through the National Board for Professional Teacher Standards.

Another pilot project allows several teacher education institutions to redesign at least one of their approved teacher education programs to align with INTASC standards.

Teacher Certification Policies. After passing the initial certification requirements of written tests in content areas and basic skills, teachers receive a standard certificate that is subject to renewal every four years. Illinois grants only provisional certificates to teachers relocating from out-of-state. New teachers are not required to undergo any special professional development activities. They are evaluated once each year for two years; this can be extended if the teacher requires ongoing support.

After two years of employment, state law requires teachers to be evaluated every two years. Districts must develop a remediation plan for any educator found to be performing unsatisfactorily. However, this requirement is not linked to recertification.

As of April 1997, there were no professional development requirements for recertification in Illinois. The only state requirement was a yearly registration fee paid to the regional office of education which is used to provide district-level professional development activities. Administrators, however, are required to participate in professional development activities to renew their certificates.

A 19-member State Teacher Certification Board (STCB) advises the SEA on certification and preservice program approval. A regional delivery system of professional development and educational services, the regional offices of education (ROEs) plays a significant role

in brokering resources for teacher professional development. The role of ROEs recently shifted from regulator to provider of technical assistance and support for local schools. There are 45 ROEs in Illinois, each with its own superintendent and four intermediate service centers. The state sponsors professional development academies for ROE staff, in cooperation with the National Staff Development Council. These academies have been replicated in other states.

State-Supported Programs. For the most part, professional development services for teachers are determined locally, with very little intervention from the state. The state does require that grades 7 to 12 teachers be trained to identify suicidal behavior in adolescents and to intervene appropriately. This requirement is not linked to licensure.

In 1992, Senate Bill 1988 was enacted, which allowed schools to bank time over and above the normal five-hour instructional day to use for in-house professional development. Thus, schools scheduling longer instructional days gain time for professional development. Once schools have accrued a certain amount of banked hours, they can release students early and use the time for staff development activities. Approximately 25 percent of the schools in Illinois take advantage of this law, including approximately 25 percent of the schools in Chicago.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Illinois uses Goals 2000 funding for subgrants to districts for professional development and preservice training to support school improvement plans, program coordination, and building community involvement. The subgrants support innovative programs that increase educators' knowledge and skills, and student achievement relative to the state goals for learning.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was mentioned in the QSI concept paper, and, in the future, the state may acknowledge National Board Certification as a way for teachers to obtain advanced teaching certificates. During the 1995-96 school year, the SEA supported a cohort of NBPTS teacher candidates by paying

their application fees, providing mentors, and arranging released time. The Carnegie Middle Grades Initiative, the Accelerated Schools program, and the Essential Schools initiative were all cited as influences on teacher professional development.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. SEA funds assist districts and regions in carrying out their professional development plans. In 1992 and 1993, \$4 million was distributed on a formula basis to districts. In the past, the state appropriated approximately \$10 million per year to support its regional education service centers. In FY 1995, \$15 million was awarded to schools through competitive state-run grant programs. The SEA Centers receive funds for their own in-service activities.

Federal Funds. Illinois participates in Goals 2000, receiving \$15,992,571 in 1996 for Year 2, of which 90 percent was used for subgrants to local districts for local improvement efforts, professional development, and preservice training. Ten percent of the funding supported the comprehensive state improvement plan by developing a system to document progress in meeting the national goals, and by providing in-service training for local education agencies.

The state receives Eisenhower funds to support professional development for teachers. In FY 1995, Illinois received \$10,904,237 from this source.

Local Funds. Local funds are the largest source of funding for professional development. Teacher license renewal fees paid to area ROEs are used to provide professional development services to teachers.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required by state law to conduct professional development activities and to design programs for continuing education to improve teachers' skills and knowledge. These programs must serve district goals and

must focus on improving student learning. The SEA provides a portion of the funding for these activities.

The SEA approves district and regional professional development plans and provides funding for their development. The ROEs are now considered to be intermediate service agencies for professional development and are required to offer training in six different subject areas. ROE staff receive training through academies sponsored by the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) and the state on mentoring and leadership development. The 45 ROEs are organized into six regional areas, each of which has a technology "hub" and a professional development director. Teacher training is developed based on local needs.

With the exception of Cook County, state regional superintendents in all Illinois counties can set aside a maximum of four days annually for professional development activities. A maximum of two days can be used for teacher workshops or institutes, and a maximum of two days can be spent on parent-teacher conferences and parent outreach. State laws regarding education in Chicago affect professional development in ways that sometimes differ from those pertaining to the rest of the state.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teachers do not usually bargain for professional development at the local level, although in some instances release time is negotiated. Teachers are compensated for professional development costs and are given salary increments for professional development in districts where resources are available, but this practice varies widely by district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Illinois teacher organizations are major providers of professional development for their members. They provide sessions on collective bargaining, school finance and law, academic training, mediation training, training to deal with

violence in schools, among other topics. The Illinois Education Association provides specialized training for schools and regular workshops and conferences for its members. It funds a center for educational innovation that focuses on school reform issues. The center is currently working with a consortium of approximately 40 schools in the Chicago area.

The American Federation of Teachers-sponsored Quest Center in Chicago is well known for its professional development work. The Quest Center has involved teachers in developing the Chicago Learner Outcomes and in creating a systemwide assessment based on those outcomes. The Quest Center holds weekly professional development activities in various sites throughout Chicago. The Chicago Teachers Union is seeking degree-granting authority in order to create a professional graduate school that would offer a master's program in teacher leadership and education reform, and that would be aligned with current work on student standards and with NBPTS teacher standards.

Illinois content-related teacher organizations provide professional development conferences for their members. The Illinois chapter of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Association of Illinois Middle Schools also provide professional development for their members.

Higher Education has not played a significant role in shaping state policies on teacher professional development. They provide professional development assistance to local districts, upon request, and sponsor professional development schools in Illinois.

Contacts/Information Resources

Anna Austin
Illinois State Board of Education
100 West Randolph Street, Suite 14-300
Chicago, IL 60601
312-814-2708

Sheryl Poggi
Illinois State Board of Education
100 West Randolph Street, Suite 14-300
Chicago, IL 60601
217-524-4832

Susan Shae
Illinois Education Association
100 East Edwards
Springfield, IL 62704

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at :

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Indiana

Number of Teachers: 55,107**Average Years of Experience: 16****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 73%****Average Salary: \$35,741¹**

Education Policy Context

Indiana's 292 school corporations served 968,933 students during the 1994-95 school year, with a pupil-teacher ratio of 17.5. In 1989, the state granted school corporations "home rule," or the necessary powers to conduct their affairs, as long as those powers are not forbidden by statute or delegated to another agency, are used in a manner consistent with prevailing state statutes and rules, and are exercised through written policies adopted by the corporation's governing body.

Over the last decade, the state's role in setting education policy has increased. At least four different legislative reform packages have been passed, including the A+ Program for Educational Excellence in 1987, the Governor's Excel Program in 1989, the Bayh-Evans Joint Education Program in 1990, and the Work Force Development Act in 1992. In addition, the state's school funding formula was revised in 1993. Reform efforts have addressed many aspects of the education enterprise, including accountability, standards and assessment, adult and workforce education, curriculum and instruction, early childhood education, education governance, education professionals, educational technology, instructional time, school finance, school restructuring, and special populations.

The State Role in Professional Development

The provision of professional development for teachers varies from corporation to corporation, but must meet state requirements for school accreditation. School corporations generally determine the level of local investment in professional development, although these matters are often negotiated with local teacher unions.

However, professional development has become a significant topic of discussion at the state level. A governor-appointed work group made recommendations regarding potential professional development initiatives in December of 1994. The work group advocated professional development policies that were attached to school and individual goals, connected to existing state initiatives, based on systemic change and long-term commitments, and compatible with state priorities as well as schoolwide plans.

The Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) addresses the issues of standards for teachers, as well as teacher preparation and continuing education programs. Legislation enacted in 1992 created the IPSB and put the Divisions of Teacher Certification, Teacher Education, and Teacher Testing and Continuing Education, and the Beginning Teacher Internship Program under its

jurisdiction. The IPSB is the agency that issues the Indiana teaching credential and maintains recertification requirements. Its responsibilities include setting and maintaining standards for educators, beginning with preservice preparation and continuing throughout their careers. The Board, whose members are primarily practicing educators, sets standards for professional education programs, teacher licensing and testing, teacher induction, and continuing education.

Providing time for teachers to pursue professional development is another major issue that has received state-level attention since 1987, when the legislature mandated that all 180 school days be used for classroom instruction. The Indiana State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) commissioned a study on the topic in 1994, and a report was presented by the Indiana Education Policy Center at Indiana University in November of that year. "Professional Development and Teacher Time: Principles, Guidelines, and Policy Options for Indiana" describes current thinking on effective professional development, state policies in Indiana and surrounding states regarding teacher professional development, guidelines for state policy and teacher time, and state options for providing more time for teachers. In addition, Indiana is a partner state with

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. Indiana adopted the Beginning Teacher Internship Program in 1988-89. Since then, all first-year teachers have been required to serve a one-year internship with a mentor teacher who is responsible for providing ongoing professional support. Beginning teachers are given five days of release time, often used for observation, and mentors are paid a stipend of \$600 for their efforts. The school's principal serves as the evaluator of the internship, periodically monitoring the new teacher and determining the ultimate success of the internship itself. Internship programs are developed individually by school corporations using guidelines provided by the state. Failure to pass the Beginning Teacher Assessment Inventory prevents a teacher from practicing in an accredited school. Since 1989, less than 3 percent of all beginning teachers have had to repeat the program or have been denied permission to practice in an accredited public school.

When teachers are initially certified, they receive a standard five-year license that enables them to teach in their subject field and grade level. After five years, teachers must apply to the IPSB for renewal of their certificates. Renewal requires either six hours of approved coursework in a teacher's certification area, 90 continuing renewal units (CRUs), or any equivalent combination of the two. CRUs are only available for teachers who hold master's degrees or have bachelor's degrees with 36 hours of additional academic credit. One CRU is awarded for every two hours of participation in a Board-approved workshop or other educational experience.

Once teachers have obtained a master's degree and five years of experience, they may apply for a professional license. A professional license is initially valid for ten years and is renewable every five years thereafter. It is important to note that these policies

have only been in effect since the 1987-88 school year. Prior to 1987, all teachers were required to obtain a master's degree within six years of obtaining an initial certificate. They were then granted a lifetime license.

The IPSB is currently in the process of restructuring Indiana's entire licensing and recertification system. The Board has issued two reports outlining strategies for redesigning the licensure process and has formed various advisory groups to address the matter further. The Board plans to have new regulations in place by August of 1998.

State-Supported Programs. Like many states, Indiana does not have one cohesive state-level system for professional development. However, one office in the SEA does support professional development linked to specific state initiatives. The Office of School and Professional Development was established in 1995 and supports the professional development efforts of the Gifted and Talented Unit, Prime Time (a state-funded program to reduce class size in the primary grades), the Indiana Academic Improvement Program (formerly Indiana 2000), Re:Learning, and teacher recognition programs. The SEA also offers workshops and conferences for teachers, but attendance is not mandatory. It operates the Indiana Principal Leadership Academy, which provides professional development for public school principals.

Other state policies that extend to all school corporations in Indiana have direct impact on teacher professional development. The two most prominent policies are Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) and accumulated time.

Since 1987, all Indiana public schools have undergone PBA review every five years in order to assess their compliance with certain legal standards, school improvement plans, and state performance standards. The state performance standards are based on student attendance, high school graduation rates, state test results, and state proficiencies in math and language arts. Professional development for teachers is addressed in the PBA policy on the school improvement process as one of nine correlates

that schools must incorporate into their own improvement plans. The PBA policy states that professional development should be directly related to school improvement and professional growth and that school faculties should be involved in planning professional development. The SEA provides professional development to schools at their request and also provides technical assistance and professional development to schools which do not receive the full five-year accreditation.

In 1990, the State Board of Education established a policy that allows schools to release students in order to conduct professional development for teachers. In order to take advantage of the policy, schools must "bank" time above the required instructional time. Specifically, schools must acquire at least 105 percent of required instructional time before they are allowed to use in-school time for professional development. Students may only be released under the provisions of an SEA-approved plan and cannot be released more than six times in any school year. However, schools may add days to their calendar in order to schedule release time for professional development or other purposes.

The state also supports three other programs that include teacher professional development as a major component: CLASS (Connecting Learning Assures Successful Students), the Indiana Academic Improvement Program (formerly Indiana 2000), and Re:Learning. Schools or school corporations compete to participate in these SEA-run programs.

CLASS was developed in 1989, with the goal of transforming schools into communities of life-long learning for teachers through a variety of professional development activities. In order for a school to participate in CLASS, the principal and school corporation superintendent must agree in writing to a two-year commitment to the program. Through a variety of professional development activities, teachers are exposed to cooperative learning, thematic instruction, and other educational innovations. The program provides stipends for schools to cover release

time and supplies. There are 115 schools that receive state support to participate in CLASS. An additional 30 schools who originally received state support for the program now continue to participate at their own expense.

Since the passing of Indiana 2000 legislation in 1991, the State Board of Education has selected certain schools to participate in the Indiana Academic Improvement Program's restructuring process. Selected schools must adopt the national education goals and work with their communities to develop plans for restructuring. The program provides small grants to designated schools, waives certain state requirements, and permits them to admit students who live within corporation boundaries but outside the school's legal attendance area. According to the SEA, most of the funding obtained by schools through Indiana 2000 is used for professional development.

Re:Learning is a collaborative effort of the Coalition for Essential Schools and the Education Commission of the States. The program requires states to make a five-year commitment to the project and to pledge support for schools to develop frameworks for change. The program focuses on improving the relationship between teachers and students, relying heavily on professional development for teachers. The state allocates funds to award grants to schools on a competitive basis.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. State funds are specifically earmarked for professional development, but these funds represent a small portion of the state's education budget. Most of these funds fall under larger initiatives, such as those mentioned above. For the 1994-95 school year, the state allocated approximately \$427,000 for the PBA program's technical assistance component, \$1.8 million for the Beginning Teacher Internship Program, and \$562,000 for the CLASS program. Since 1992, the state has earmarked \$675,000 per year for the Indiana Academic Improvement Pro-

gram, and \$300,000 per year for Re:Learning.

Federal Funds. Federal funds also support a significant portion of teacher professional development activities in the state. As mentioned above, Indiana is participating in Goals 2000. It also receives Eisenhower and Title I funds, which are used to support professional development. In FY 1995, Indiana received \$4,510,391 in Eisenhower funding.

Local Funds. The most significant source of funding for teacher professional development in Indiana is the local school corporation. However, the level of funding varies from corporation to corporation.

The Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

As a part of the state's PBA policy, schools are required to plan professional development for teachers and document their activities. Local school corporations are not required by the state to have a specific local budget allocation for professional development.

Schools are required by the state to periodically evaluate all teachers on their performance in the classroom and to make recommendations for their professional improvement when necessary. The evaluation plans are developed locally, following state guidelines. Plans must include opportunities for growth and teacher development and may ultimately be used in making employment decisions.

Schools are also permitted to accumulate time for teacher professional development by extending the school day.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is bargained for on a local level in two ways. Time to pursue professional development is often negotiated, and teachers bargain for salary increments related to the professional development they have obtained.

Of 289 corporations surveyed in 1994, 275 provided some type of contractual time for professional development. When district resources allow, teachers may be reimbursed for tuition and other professional development expenses. Policies vary from corporation to corporation.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Teacher organizations play significant local- and state-level roles in discussions regarding teacher professional development. They also provide professional development for their members on a regular basis. The Indiana State Teacher's Association (ISTA) holds a two-day instructional conference each year that hosts a wealth of workshops. ISTA eventually wants to establish regional academies that would be collaborations between local ISTA affiliates and higher education institutions. The Indiana Federation of Teachers, as well as state teacher subject-matter organizations, also provide professional development to their members.

Institutions of higher education offer professional development in various ways. An increasing number of higher education institutions work with professional development schools. Most offer courses, workshops, or summer programs for relicensure purposes. Many universities and colleges have developed ongoing relationships with local school corporations and provide professional support to local school faculties.

There are ten education service centers in Indiana that were originally established as purchasing cooperatives for local school corporations. Some of these groups deliver professional development services to schools.

Independent consultants brought in by local school corporations are considered to be the largest source of professional development in the state. Professional development is also provided by district personnel and SEA staff.

The use of distance learning for teacher professional development is gaining a foothold in Indiana. Some

school districts utilize two-way video systems to access providers who would have been otherwise difficult or impossible to reach. In the State Department of Workforce Development, a new program, the Virtual School-to-Work Institute, will provide professional development opportunities to teachers over the Internet.

Contacts/Information Resources

Phyllis Land Usher
Senior Officer
Indiana Department of Education
Center for School Improvement
and Performance
Room 229, Statehouse
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-232-9101

Marilyn Scannel
Executive Director
Indiana Professional Standards Board
251 East Ohio Street, Suite 201
Indianapolis, IN 46204-9010
317-232-9023

Dan Clark
Information Services Coordinator
Indiana State Teachers Association
150 West Market Street, Suite 900
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-634-1515

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Iowa

Number of Teachers: 31,616
Average Years of Experience: 17
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 31%
Average Salary: \$30,760¹

Education Policy Context

Iowa's K-12 public education system is comprised of 379 districts and serves an average student enrollment of 500,000. Iowa students consistently demonstrate a high level of success on nationally standardized tests, which state officials attribute to an education policy that supports strong local control. There is no state assessment, nor has the state adopted curriculum standards or graduation requirements. In 1989, the Iowa General Assembly passed sections 280.12 and 280.18 of the Iowa Code, requiring the establishment of high academic expectations for all students. In keeping with Iowa's tradition of strong local control, the state sets the parameters and provides guidance, while districts maintain responsibility for establishing their own academic achievement goals and assessments. Districts must also report student progress to the community through an annual report. The state's district accreditation process incorporates these requirements and provides the mechanisms for monitoring their implementation.

Funding to support this school improvement process was provided through the Educational Excellence Program. Introduced in 1987, the program consists of three major phases: (I) recruitment of quality teachers; (II)

retention of quality teachers; and (III) enhancement of the quality and effectiveness of teachers. Phase I establishes a minimum starting teacher salary of \$18,000, and Phase II supports teacher salary-scale increases. Phase III provides pay incentives for superior performance and/or participation in training activities or extra work assignments (e.g., curriculum development and school-based decision making). The Educational Excellence Program is supported through an annual \$80-million state appropriation.

In January of 1991, the State Board of Education (SBE) revisited its reform agenda; after a year-long process of meeting with professional educators, business leaders, and community groups across the state, the SBE issued its strategic plan in December of 1992. Entitled, *Education is Iowa's Future: The State Plan for Educational Excellence in the 21st Century*, the report renews that state's commitment to high expectations, teacher development and professional growth, education infrastructure, and local accountability. A second update of the strategic plan was issued in March of 1994. Most recently, Iowa passed the School Improvement Technology Act (1996), which provides \$150 million over the next five years for districts to purchase hardware and software and to provide professional staff development for classroom instruc-

tional technology using the statewide Iowa Communications Network.

Iowa's system of local autonomy is balanced with a unique blend of infrastructure support, research-based knowledge, and inter-agency coordination. The New Iowa Schools Development Corporation (NISDC), established in 1991, is a nonprofit corporation governed by a board of directors that includes state-level organizations representing teachers, parents, business, school administrators, local boards, state agencies, community colleges, and elected government officials. NISDC provides a forum for collaboration, consensus building, and networking in the areas of education reform and school improvement. The FINE (First in the Nation in Education) Foundation is a state-chartered, independent educational research organization. Since the mid-1980s, FINE has implemented a research agenda to improve teaching and learning in Iowa's K-12 classrooms by: gathering information about and evaluating education trends/strategies; bringing educational research into the classroom; disseminating practical research to educators and policy makers; training educators to use educational research; collaborating with Iowa educators to ensure effective implementation of instructional strategies; and sharing research results with regional laboratories and national research institutes.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

The State Role in Professional Development

There are no state-adopted standards for the professional development of Iowa's educators. Iowa's school improvement strategic plan has four major goals, one of which is to "enhance educator's development and renewal in order to increase opportunities of all students for productive lifelong learning." The state encourages local districts to implement professional development activities by providing Phase III funds. Phase III funds are distributed to districts with state-approved plans for incentive pay that awards teachers for demonstrated competence, participation in school improvement efforts, or participation in professional growth training activities. The intent of Phase III is to develop teachers as instructional leaders.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) was established in statute by the state legislature in 1989. The governor-appointed, 11-member Board is composed of five teachers, four administrators, an Iowa Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) representative, and a non-certified lay-person who has a demonstrated interest in education. The BOEE has authority to set policy on matters pertaining to the licensure of all public school certified personnel. The BOEE also makes recommendations to the SBE regarding standards for the approval of professional development programs.

Iowa currently uses a three-tier teacher licensure system. The Provisional License is issued upon completion of all preservice requirements and is valid for two years. After two years of successful teaching experience, teachers advance to the Educational License. Teachers with five years of teaching experience and a master's degree are eligible to receive a Professional Teacher's License. Educational and Professional Licenses may be renewed every five years by accumulating renewal units—eight and six units, respectively. One renewal unit is awarded for every 15 contact hours and can be

earned through college credit and participation in approved staff development activities. The BOEE has established "renewal centers" in each of the Area Educational Agencies (see below) to provide teachers with easy access and support when applying for licensure renewal. Formerly, this application process was only available through the SEA.

The BOEE spearheads the Renaissance Initiative in Practitioner Licensure, which is revising the process and rules for licensure. The Initiative incorporates recommendations from the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and is based upon two guiding principles: developing licensure standards, and developing a practitioner framework that emphasizes a continuum approach from "initial preparation through induction to life-long professional development." The BOEE issued a concept paper in December of 1995 that was disseminated to practitioners and educator associations for review. The paper presents examples of the new teaching standards and identifies ten "basic principles" for beginning teachers. It proposes a revised system of licensure that would include an initial license, a continuing license (issued upon completion of an induction program), and an advanced license (issued with eight years of teaching experience and a master's degree or National Board Certification). The paper also proposes expanding the range of endorsement areas and providing greater flexibility in the earning of renewal units. Formal adoption of all proposed modifications is expected by 1998; complete implementation should occur by the year 2002.

The proposed induction program provides mentoring support to beginning teachers. Under this program, new teachers would be assigned a trained mentor during their first year. Mentors and beginning teachers would receive the equivalent of five days of release time to participate in planning, demonstration, observation, and feedback and induction workshops. Mentors would receive a \$1,000 stipend, paid by the district. Districts that volunteer to

implement an induction program would receive a state allocation of \$250 for each beginning teacher and be required to establish a district committee and to appoint a district facilitator to oversee implementation. The BOEE would appoint a Director of Induction (housed within the SEA) to review and approve local induction plans, monitor mentor training in accordance with BOEE guidelines, and provide technical assistance to induction facilitators at the district level. The induction concept was adopted by the SBE in 1996, and the BOEE is seeking \$1.9 million from the state to support this activity during 1997-98.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA provides limited direct professional development services to districts. The state uses a regional provider system comprised of Area Education Agencies (AEAs). Created by the Iowa legislature in 1974, the 15 AEAs provide state and federally required special education services, certain specified media services, and other educational services as determined by a local governing board representing the school districts of a service area. In addition, the Technology Act requires AEAs to provide districts with technology planning and technology-related staff development. AEAs serve as intermediate units between the SEA and local districts. Funding support for AEAs is generated through direct state aid, local property taxes, and grants. AEAs also may apply for Phase III funds from the state. Federal and private funds are also used, and additional fees may be collected through direct management service contracts with individual districts.

The SEA works collaboratively with AEAs and, in 1994, formed the AEA/Department of Education (AEA/DE) Collaborative "to identify strategies, avoid duplication of efforts, fill gaps in service, and develop a truly cohesive system of service support." The Collaborative meets twice each year to determine roles and responsibilities and strengthen communication among education service providers in the state. The Service Coordinating Council carries out the work of the AEA/DE Collaborative. One focal area of the Council's work is

professional development. The Council is developing resources to identify best practices, staff development providers, and other materials that link to standards-based reform.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Iowa is using a federal Star School Grant to fund Technology-Based Curriculum Development Projects across the state. This mini-grant program seeks to encourage partnerships focused on instructional technology among districts, AEAs, higher education institutions, and businesses. Through this project, the partnerships will develop and share instructional materials that incorporate distance learning. Teachers will receive training in the use of distance learning applications. Under the Iowa Communications Network (ICN), the Iowa Distance Education Alliance (IDEA) is developing an electronic link to make the necessary software applications available to all K-12 school districts by the year 2000. Six Star School grants (up to \$200,000 per project) will be awarded in 1996-97.

Goals 2000 funds are allocated to support local school improvement planning efforts.

Public Funds for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not provide categorical aid to districts for professional development. However, through the Educational Excellence Program, an annual appropriation of \$26 million is available for distribution to districts who apply for Phase III funds, which provide salary incentives for certain instructional duties and/or staff development. These funds must directly support staff development and other activities that promote the districts' student achievement goals. Phase III allocations average \$800 per teacher.

The state has earmarked \$450,000 of technology funds to be distributed among the AEAs for the purpose of providing technical assistance to districts. AEAs are required to submit a technology plan to the SEA for approval.

Federal Funds. During the 1995-96 school year, Iowa received a \$2.2-million

Eisenhower grant and a \$3.2-million Goals 2000 grant. Iowa is using a \$1.2-million Star Schools grant to support its technology-based curriculum project.

Local Funds. Local set-asides for professional development are not required. Districts that apply for Phase III funds employ a variety of incentive options that are determined by local school boards. Districts may also use Technology Act funds to support professional development.

The AEAs are primarily funded through local budgets, based on a student enrollment formula that includes public and accredited nonpublic schools served by the AEAs. Each AEA allotment represents their service area student enrollment multiplied by the average per-pupil cost of services provided by the AEA. In 1994-95, the total AEA allocation for special education services (partly funded through state aid) was \$84.5 million, or \$155 per student; \$15.7 million for media services, or \$29 per student; and \$17.3 million for educational services, or \$32 per student.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required to develop and submit school improvement plans to the SEA, in accordance with sections 280.12 and 280.18. To augment their plans, districts may apply for Phase III funds, which are distributed based on proposals developed by the districts and approved by the SEA. Although district participation in Phase III programming is voluntary, during the 1995-96 school year, every district in the state participated. When the SEA conducted its evaluation of Phase III in 1989-90, all but two districts had received Phase III funds. More than half (58 percent) implemented a combination pay plan, containing both performance-based and supplemental pay incentives; 38 percent used all of their funds for supplemental pay. Participating districts and teachers reported a high degree of satisfaction with the program and indicated that Phase III was accomplishing its goals as intended by the legislature.

There is no statewide minimum requirement for professional development days. The official school-year calendar consists of 180 instructional days. Most districts negotiate a 190-day contract to allow for other non-instructional activities. Iowa districts may also seek waivers to reschedule the school day or school year in order to accumulate more time for collegial planning and staff development activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries are negotiated through local bargaining agreements. Generally, teachers are awarded step increases based on years of experience and graduate degrees or credits earned beyond the bachelor's. Districts have the option of using Phase III funds to provide tuition or travel reimbursement for teachers who attend college courses, conferences, or workshops. Most often, Phase III funds are used to pay teachers for work that supports the district's school improvement plan. According to an SEA evaluation of Phase III activities conducted during the 1989-90 school year, 87 percent of Iowa's teachers received incentive pay; 21 percent received reimbursement for workshop/conference fees; 15 percent received reimbursement for travel to attend training events; and 11 percent received tuition reimbursement.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Iowa State Education Association (ISEA) actively promotes policies that support professional development. The ISEA works collaboratively with state policy makers, AEAs, universities, and local districts to enhance the quality of professional growth opportunities for Iowa's teachers. In 1968, the ISEA founded the concept of "cadre-training," when it began implementing the Mobile In-service Teaching Laboratory (MISTL). MISTL is a day-long, in-service activity that offers participants an array of topic areas to meet professional growth needs.

The goals of MISTL are to provide hands-on training and material that can be used on the next day of instruction and to offer teachers a stimulating alternative for learning new skills and changing practices. Recent MISTLs have featured Methods and Techniques of Teaching Reading, Wellness for Teachers (stress management), and Using Telecommunications Technology. Each year, ISEA selects five sites to host this initiative, which costs \$5,000 per site and requires a minimum of 250 participants. Over 150 Iowa districts have served as MISTL co-sponsors. The program is offered free as a professional development service of the ISEA.

The BOEE has expressed interest in piloting a professional development school (PDS) in the state and is working with Iowa State University to conduct a study of national trends and local needs for the establishment of a PDS. Institutions of higher education (IHEs) in Iowa have concentrated on degree-driven programs as their primary contribution to the professional development of teachers. IHEs are not authorized to award continuing education units; however, under revisions proposed by the BOEE, this option may soon become available. It would enhance the range of course offerings and professional development activities offered by colleges and universities.

The Institute for Collaborative Leadership in Education at Drake University's School of Education has a Resource Center (RC) that provides educational resources and support services to state and local school personnel regarding individuals with disabilities. The RC offers technical assistance on activities such as staff development, behavioral assessment, parents and families, and legal/policy matters. The RC houses the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center (a federally funded, multi-state project), the Parent-Education Connection, and the Iowa Learning Resource Network. These programs provide training, conferences, resource materials, and networking venues for Iowa educators.

The IOWA/US WEST Teacher Technology Project was created in 1995 through the joint collaboration of the US WEST Foundation, the University of Northern Iowa (UNI), the SEA, professional and school associations, local school districts, public television, and the AEAs. The Project's goal is to provide training and resources to Iowa K-12 educators to become proficient in the use and instructional application of computer-based telecommunications. Using the ISEA's cadre-based, trainer-of-trainers delivery model, the Project is expected to provide a series of 15 three-day training workshops to a total of 400 teachers in the summer of 1997. During the 1997-98 school year, these teachers will be responsible for training ten additional teachers within their home districts. UNI faculty will design and oversee the summer training workshops, and the regional AEAs will provide local assistance and support to teacher-trainers during the year. Training participants will be eligible to receive license renewal units or graduate credit through participating universities. The Project receives funding support through a combination of private, state, and federal sources.

Contacts/Information Resources

Dwight Carlson
Assistant to the Director
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
515-281-3436

Orrin Nearhoof
Executive Director
State Board of Educational Examiners
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0147
515-281-5849

James H. Sutton
Staff Specialist for Professional Issues
Iowa State Education Association
4025 Tonawanda Drive
Des Moines, IA 50311-3418
515-279-9711

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Kansas

Number of Teachers: 30,283

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%

Average Salary: \$31,700¹

Education Policy Context

Kansas is implementing an education reform agenda that is results-oriented and high-stakes. The State Board of Education (SBE) initiated major reform efforts in 1989 by issuing *Strategic Directions*, a philosophical framework for lifelong learning. *Strategic Directions* emphasizes seven education program goals: early childhood education, results-oriented curriculum and instruction, student-centered learning environments, parental involvement, staff development, learning communities, and business involvement.

The cornerstone of the current reform initiative is Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA). Adopted by the SBE in 1991, QPA uses curriculum standards, a performance-based assessment system, and at least two other locally-determined measures to hold schools accountable for demonstrating student progress. Statewide task forces consisting of educators, community members, and business representatives developed the curriculum standards. Recommendations from these groups were reviewed by content-area experts to ensure the standards met "world-class" expectations. In 1993, the SBE officially received curriculum standards for mathematics, science, communications (reading and writing), and social studies. The standards will be reviewed periodically

by the state curricular advisory committees and modified as needed, with the SBE reviewing each revision as it is completed.

The SBE has contracted with the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation (CETE) at the University of Kansas to design, administer, score, and analyze the results of the state assessment system for QPA. CETE works collaboratively with educators at the state and local levels to design the assessments. When assessment results are reported, they reference a Standard of Excellence that establishes proficiency standards for building performance in relation to average student performance. Schools are expected to make progress toward the building performance standards. The new state assessment for mathematics and reading are administered annually. Writing, science, and social studies assessments are administered every two years.

In addition to student learning outcomes, QPA examines process indicators including indicators of staff development and professional growth. QPA requires the development of site-based councils and requires school improvement plans to be submitted to the SBE each accreditation cycle. The plan must include a staff development component that identifies three staff development priorities and provides documentation on how staff development activities have affected instructional strategies. QPA's emphasis on

the role teacher professional development plays in student learning and school improvement is consistent with the SBE's long-term commitment to this area. As described below, the ongoing training and professional growth of Kansas teachers has been and remains a policy priority.

The State Role in Professional Development

The SBE adopted an official professional development policy for Kansas public school educators in 1972, identifying this area as a key educational goal for school improvement. It was not until 1981, however, that a state plan for teacher in-service activities was created. This preliminary plan provided the basis for a 1983 pilot effort of the Kansas Inservice Education Program (KIP). KIP encourages local decision making and long-range planning for staff development. Participating districts are required to establish a professional development council, conduct an in-service needs assessment, and develop a five-year in-service education plan that outlines objectives, activities to be conducted, and evaluation criteria. The plan is submitted to the SBE for approval. In 1985, the Kansas legislature passed the State Inservice Opportunity Act, which provided funding specifically to support KIP activities. The funding allocation was instrumental in expanding the

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

voluntary program that, in 1992, became a statewide mandate. In 1994, the Inservice Education Opportunities Act was amended, and the SBE guidelines for KIP activities were modified to promote results-based staff development. Schools are now required to report annually on the implementation of their staff development priorities for school improvement. Each school is also required to develop a long-range results-based staff development plan to support their school improvement efforts.

The Kansas Staff Development Council (KSDC), an affiliate of the National Staff Development Council (NSDC), was established in 1989. It assists state and local educators in designing and implementing staff development activities. The KSDC and SBE collaborated in 1992 to prepare a policy paper, entitled *Results Based Staff Development*, which was developed in response to QPA's process indicators for staff development. Results-based staff development shifts the focus of in-service planning and evaluation away from numbers of participants, teacher satisfaction ratings, and accumulation of in-service credits. Instead, the design and evaluation of in-service activities is determined by whether or how the training aligns with the overall school improvement process and the degree to which teachers' instructional strategies and student learning skills are improved as a result of in-service activities. The SBE provided ten one-day training sessions (at different locations across the state) on the process of developing and implementing results-based staff development. Using a trainer-of-trainers model, cadres of educators are available to assist districts and schools in implementing the framework of effective staff development: knowledge, demonstration, practice, feedback and coaching, and follow-up.

In addition, Kansas is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Kansas Teaching and School Adminis-

tration Professional Standards Advisory Board (PSB) was established in 1969 and reconfigured in 1984 for the purpose of developing and recommending rules and regulations for teacher and administrator standards, selection, preparation, and recertification. The 21-member SBE-appointed PSB consists of ten classroom teachers, seven school administrators, two school of education representatives, one PTA member and one local school board representative.

In 1993, the SBE charged the PSB with providing recommendations for the redesign of teacher preparation and certification policies to reflect a performance-based licensing system. In its initial draft, entitled *The Redesign of Licensure of Kansas Educators*, the PSB identified a continuum of professional growth beginning with Phase I, which is preservice preparation. Phase II would consist of an extended field-based preparatory period, called the Conditional License Period, during which beginning educators would be required to demonstrate the dispositions and performances necessary to obtain professional licensure. This demonstration would occur in a school setting with professional support provided by a local education agency, a teacher education institution, and the SBE. Upon successful completion of Phase II, the educator would advance to Phase III, during which requirements for licensure renewal are established through a joint teacher/district decision-making process and revised periodically to ensure continued professional growth. The PSB is refining components of the proposed three-stage process, and final recommendations will be submitted to the SBE in May of 1997.

Under existing teacher certification policies in the state of Kansas, new teachers are issued a three-year Initial Certificate. After completing two years of teaching experience, teachers are upgraded to the five-year Standard Certificate, which is renewable upon completion of college credit hours, in-service education points, or a combination of both.

A state-supported Internship Program for first-year teachers was piloted from 1985-89. The state model created school-based assistance teams (consist-

ing of administrators and senior teachers) to provide guidance and evaluate new teacher performance during the first year. Originally, new teachers were issued a one-year certificate, and school-based assistance teams were given authority for determining teachers' advancement to the standard certificate. However, the program's linkage to certification was dropped in 1989, because assistance team members reported that their interaction with new teachers had become too evaluative in nature; much less time was being spent providing nurturance and non-judgmental support. Funding to expand the Internship Program was not extended beyond the pilot phase. Nonetheless, SBE officials report that many districts have developed beginning teacher support programs on their own. It is also anticipated that the new teacher certification policies currently being developed by the PSB will include regulations modeled after the internship program.

State-Supported Programs. The Kansas State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) provides professional development services to local systems through a variety of program offices and federal grants for technical education, student support services, community colleges and community education. SEA staff work collaboratively with the KSDC to conduct training activities and respond to local requests for on-site, in-service planning and implementation. The SEA is also in the process of expanding its management information system to include information on technical assistance and training resources available throughout the state. This staff development electronic link is expected to be fully operational by 1997-98.

Frequently, state-supported staff development services are provided through 11 regional Education Service Centers (ESCs). Established in 1986, the ESCs provide resource support, technical assistance, and training opportunities to clusters of districts located in their service areas. The ESCs offer in-service activities related to QPA reforms (e.g., training on aligning curriculum to state standards, on interpreting and utilizing

assessment results, and on team-building skills).

An SEA program consultant for staff development coordinates the Kansas Inservice Program and the staff development component for QPA. For the past seven years, the SEA has sponsored an annual "Effective Schools Conference" in the spring. This two-day event assembles, on average, 700 Kansas educators to focus on topics and techniques that have proven to promote effective schooling. For the past 11 years, the SEA has also co-sponsored the Spring Staff Development Leadership Conference with KSDC, which provides staff developers, administrators, and teachers with up-to-date knowledge and skills in the quality results-based staff development practices in place across the state and the nation.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Kansas' Goals 2000 Preservice Teacher Education and Professional Development subgrants are available to local districts in partnership with institutions of higher education and other non-profit organizations to improve preservice education programs and support ongoing professional development for teachers and administrators. Approximately 26 grants of up to \$25,000 have been awarded on a competitive basis each year. These subgrants involve 150 districts and serve 291,718 students.

Eisenhower Professional Development Programs in Mathematics and Science are supported by federal Title II dollars. For the past three years, funding has been provided to sponsor the Summer Science Leadership Institutes, which prepares cadres of trained teachers who are well-versed in current trends in science teaching and who provide workshops for other science teachers in Kansas. Participants commit to providing a minimum of five days of in-service training to other teachers throughout the following school year. The Kansas Mathematics Leadership Academy provides a year-long professional development opportunity for 80 K-12 educators each year. It includes a four-day summer institute focusing on the Kansas Mathematics Curriculum Standards, two-day

seminars in the fall and spring that focus on assessment in mathematics and research-based instructional strategies for the classroom, and distance learning sessions broadcasted throughout the school year that address national, state, and classroom issues in mathematics education. Other professional development activities include: Mathematics Academies, which train a cadre of over 150 K-12 teachers on standards and state assessments, a videotaped professional development series in math and one in science, and workshops on problem-solving.

The Carl Perkins Applied Technology and Vocational Educational Act provides funding for professional development for secondary and postsecondary instructors in institutions with state-approved vocational education programs. The funding may be used for both in-state and out-of-state in-service activities as well as for release time for curriculum development as part of an approved program improvement plan. The minimum grant for secondary programs is \$15,000, and the minimum for postsecondary programs is \$50,000. Professional development activities must target the priorities of the Perkins legislation.

A content standards grant from the U.S. Department of Education provides professional development for Kansas educators in the field of communication arts. This includes reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment. The grant has provided free workshops for all Kansas educators and, during 1996-97, is paying the registration fees and expenses for 30 teachers.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. State appropriations for KIP have steadily increased from an initial 1985 allocation of \$750,000 to a funding level of \$5.4 million during 1995-96. The state legislature cut the funding level by \$1.5 million in 1996-97.

Federal Funds. Many schools and districts receive funding from federal sources such as Goals 2000, Eisenhower,

and Title I. A total of \$566,091 in Goals 2000 funds were awarded to local education agencies in 1995-96 for partnership activities with institutions of higher education. Kansas received \$2,239,382 in federal Eisenhower Professional Development funds in 1995-96.

Local Funds. District-sponsored professional development is generally funded by KIP and federal sources. Districts have the option of paying fees to participate in services provided by the ESCs.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Under QPA, schools are required to demonstrate process outcomes, one of which includes professional development. Schools must design and implement a staff development plan that links in-service activities to the goals outlined in school improvement plans. Site-based councils are responsible for reviewing the training needs and activities presented in the plan. Schools must submit an annual report that documents the progress made on QPA outcomes. Staff development activities are measured according to teachers' implementation of training techniques and concepts in the classroom and, where documented, their effects on student learning.

KIP requires all districts to establish a professional development council to conduct periodic in-service needs assessments and to develop and oversee the implementation of the district's five-year in-service plan. Districts with state-approved in-service plans are eligible to receive a 60 percent reimbursement from the state for expenses related to KIP activities. Inservice plans must be based on needs identified at the individual, building, and district levels. When KIP became a mandated program in 1992, the Kansas legislature required districts to provide at least three in-service days during the school year. Currently, however, there is no minimum in-service day requirement. SEA officials estimate that most districts allot between two and ten in-service days, with an average number of six per year.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teachers often receive reimbursement for expenses related to professional development activities through district involvement in KIP and other grant programs. Since 1985, teachers have been able to accumulate in-service education points to renew their certification and, in some districts, to advance on local salary schedules. Decisions regarding teacher compensation for professional development are determined at the local level.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Kansas National Education Association (KNEA) is a major provider of teacher professional development. Through its Instructional Advocacy and UniServ programs, KNEA offers training workshops and responds to requests for staff development at the state and local levels. In addition, KNEA sponsors an annual, one-day Spring Instructional Conference that provides workshops on instructional themes. KNEA also publishes a catalog of its instructional advocacy programs.

The Jones Institute for Educational Excellence is housed in the Teachers College at Emporia State University. Formed in 1982, the Jones Institute conducts research and provides technical assistance in the areas of education reform and best practices. Institute activities concentrate on special projects, sponsored research, publications, and conferences. In 1992, the Institute became one of 27 field-test sites across the country to receive a grant from the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) to assist teachers in obtaining National Board Certification. Since then, the Institute has provided National Board Certification preparation classes and other resource support to over 50 teachers from Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Nebraska. Through continued funding from Emporia State University, the Institute is expanding its

efforts to promote National Board Certification by meeting with state legislators and the SBE.

The Kansas Alliance of Professional Development Schools (KAPDS) was officially formed in 1991 by the University of Kansas as an outgrowth of the University's work with the Holmes Group. In conjunction with area public schools and business leaders, the University of Kansas established an Executive Council and identified four KAPDS sites. Each KAPDS site developed a three-year improvement plan. Approximately 200 teachers are involved in KAPDS activities, which include a two-day summer institute, school- and university-based professional development throughout the school year, and a winter banquet. KAPDS funds support a University liaison for each site and pay for teacher substitutes. Program funds are provided by the University of Kansas at \$30,000 per year.

Contacts/Information Resources

Dale Dennis
Deputy Commissioner
Kansas Department of Education
120 SE Tenth Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182
913-296-3202

Kathy Boyer
Education Program Consultant
for Staff Development
Kansas Department of Education
120 SE Tenth Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612-1182
913-296-3798

Sharrilyn Honacki
President
Kansas Staff Development Council
USD #204 Bonner Springs
2200 S. 138th Street
Bonner Springs, KS 66012
913-422-5600

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Kentucky

Number of Teachers: 37,324
Average Years of Experience: 15
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 57%
Average Salary: \$31,639¹

Education Policy Context

Kentucky's public schools serve over 650,000 students who attend school in 176 districts. The districts vary widely in size, ranging from Jefferson County, which includes Louisville, to small independent districts like Paintsville. Kentucky has undergone more changes in its public education system in the last ten years than any other state in the nation. In addition, no state has been more closely watched by the educational community and other stakeholders as it implements statewide education reforms. In 1989, the Kentucky Supreme Court delivered a landmark decision, ruling that the state's public school system was unconstitutional and further describing the conditions it deemed to be essential and minimal characteristics of an efficient system of common (public) schools. The General Assembly used this opportunity to rethink all aspects of the state's education system and created a Task Force on Education Reform. The Task Force formed committees on curriculum, finance, and governance, which worked with consultants and stakeholders to develop recommendations. Based on these recommendations, the General Assembly drafted the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA), which became law on July 13, 1990. The Act was amended in each subsequent session of the General Assembly—in 1992, 1994, and 1996.

KERA's components include: educational goals indicating what graduates should know and be able to do; an assessment process to determine if students are reaching these goals; an accountability system holding schools responsible for student success; increased funding for professional development activities for educators to help students succeed; a new system for credentialing teachers; early childhood programs; funding to help students who require more time to achieve academic success; a major commitment to technology; full-service schools inclusive of community and agency resources; changes in the governance structure to alter the politics in Kentucky school districts; and an equalized funding system, as well as a commitment to fund the new initiatives.

The legislation also addressed policy structures. The position of the elected Superintendent of Public Instruction was abolished in 1992 by an amendment to Kentucky's constitution, and almost all of this position's duties were transferred to the appointed Commissioner of Education. KERA also abolished the existing Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) on June 30, 1991, and reorganized it to include new positions and a new service-oriented mission, effective July 1, 1991. The credentialing of teachers was moved from the SEA to the Education Profes-

sional Standards Board, an autonomous body appointed by the governor. KERA also established the Office of Education Accountability (OEA) under the Legislative Research Commission (LRC). The mission of OEA is to monitor the public education system and the implementation of KERA. The State Board of Education (SBE) is comprised of 11 members appointed by the governor and confirmed by the General Assembly and is responsible for managing the public schools, adopting policies for the SEA, and hiring and evaluating the Commissioner of Education.

The State Role in Professional Development

High-quality, timely, and accessible professional development is regarded as being critical to the success of KERA. Statutes, regulations, and department-issued program advisories all reinforce the importance of professional development to successful educational reform. KERA addresses professional development by:

- requiring local districts to use four days of the minimum school term for professional development (districts were permitted to request up to five additional instructional days for professional development from the 1992-93 school year through the 1995-96 school year);

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

- requiring schools to provide professional development programs and shifting responsibility for planning professional development to school staff;
- providing funding at \$23 per average daily attendance (ADA) of students in 1996-97; and
- allocating responsibility for 65 percent of the funds for professional development to school-based decision-making councils.

The professional development regulations promulgated by the SBE were revised in May of 1995. The regulations outline the professional development process; create standards for school and district professional development plans; and delineate the responsibilities and authority of the district professional development coordinator. In addition, Kentucky is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies.

Kentucky has a three-tiered certification system. Initial certification begins at Rank III, which requires a bachelor's degree and the completion of an internship. Rank II teachers must hold a master's degree or have completed a planned, fifth-year program. For fifth-year programs, professional development tied to an individual's professional growth plan may be substituted for up to 12 college credits, if approved by the college. Rank I requires 30 hours beyond the master's degree, acquired within eight years of attaining a BA. Recently, the state passed legislation allowing teachers to use National Board Certification as a substitute for graduate work to attain Rank I status.

The Education Professional Standards Board is comprised of 17 members, including the Chief State School Officer and the Executive Director of the Council on Higher Education, who serve as ex-officio voting members. The remaining members, appointed by the governor, are

nine teachers, one member of a local board of education, one principal, one superintendent, two deans of public colleges of education, and one chief administrator from an independent college or university.

By statute, the Board is authorized: (1) to establish standards and requirements for obtaining and maintaining a teaching certificate; (2) to issue, renew, suspend, and revoke teaching certificates; (3) to reduce and streamline the credentialing system to allow greater flexibility in staffing local schools, while maintaining standards for teacher competence; (4) to develop a Professional Code of Ethics; (5) to set standards for, approve, and evaluate teacher preparation programs; (6) to maintain data and submit reports to the governor and the General Assembly on employment trends, the performance of certified personnel, and the quality of professional preparation programs; and (7) to study the problem of the declining pool of minority teachers in Kentucky and submit recommendations for increasing their numbers.

The Board has been active in standards setting, piloting performance-based assessments with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and streamlining certification. In addition, they have revised Kentucky's ten-year-old New Teacher Intern Program, incorporating standards as the basis for decision making and adopting a system that begins with entry into the teacher preparation program and that spans the completion of the intern program. New teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than two years of successful teaching experience are issued a provisional certificate and are required to pass written tests and to complete a one-year internship. They are assigned a committee that includes a principal, a resource teacher, and a teacher educator appointed by a regional university. This support committee is trained in a state-developed supervision and assessment process and engages the new teacher in clinical supervision. Although the program guidelines fall under the jurisdiction of the Board, the program itself is funded through a separate line item in the SEA's budget. Kentucky is also part

of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE) New Professional Teacher Project and uses NCATE standards for the accreditation of teacher training institutions.

State-Supported Programs. The state supports reforms in schools and districts through eight regional service centers (RSCs). RSC staff include consultants with expertise in technology, curriculum and assessment, school-based decision making, instructional strategies in writing, extended school services, and exceptional child education. The state has also created district consortia through which local systems combine resources to make professional development opportunities and other needed services more accessible and responsive to the needs of schools and districts. Originally, districts were required to join these professional development consortia; however, this requirement has recently been rescinded. It is too early to determine whether delivery systems will change significantly.

Although the SEA provides professional development services through its Professional Development Division, other SEA units also offer teacher training. Technology training is coordinated through the Office of Technology, and a significant investment is being made to prepare teachers and administrators to use the Kentucky Educational Technology System (KETS). Training and other professional development experiences related to assessment and curriculum development are coordinated by the Office of Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability. This office has developed a teacher cadre, called KERA Fellows, who have volunteered to be trained in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. These teachers remain in their districts and act as professional development resources. RSCs offer a program called RSC Associates, who are teachers trained in systems thinking and meeting management techniques and who participate in a network to increase regional capacity. Other teacher networks and cadres have been developed, such as writing cluster leaders, math portfolio resource teachers, the gifted and talented professional development

cadre, school technology coordinators, and the elementary resource teacher network—all of which are building local capacity to assist teachers with new classroom practices.

In addition, the Office of School Improvement identifies and trains Distinguished Educators (DEs). DEs are highly skilled teachers and administrators who are released from their district obligations to spend two years providing technical assistance to schools in other districts, particularly those identified through the accountability system as being "in crisis." DEs worked with 53 schools in 1995-96, and a vast majority made significant gains in student performance. The number of schools requiring or requesting DEs increased for 1996-97; however, budget cuts have reduced their number to 40.

Teachers have taken on new leadership roles as members of school-based decision-making councils. In 1996, the General Assembly directed that all new members of councils participate in a minimum of six clock hours of training, with an annual follow-up of three clock hours. The SEA approves training providers, but does not specify the content, which is determined locally based on individual council needs. In addition, attention has been given to the role of the principal in providing effective leadership to empower teachers to assume new roles. The SEA has developed a series of "For Principals Only" seminars and workshops to help principals develop new content and leadership skills that reinforce and support teachers' efforts to reform practice.

The Commonwealth Institute for Teachers (CIT) was established in 1984 to promote educational excellence among teachers. The Reform Act of 1990 reinforced the premise of the CIT, and it continues to provide quality learning experiences for teachers. Its current format supports approximately 100 teachers each year in a summer week-long institute, which is augmented by two weekends of follow-up during the school year.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded Kentucky a \$9.7-

million Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant to help teachers improve their skills in teaching science, mathematics, and technology. Kentucky's SSI, called PRISM, is coordinated by the Kentucky Science and Technology Council in Lexington. Working in conjunction with other NSF-funded projects, PRISM has trained math, science, and technology specialists who serve as professional development resources in their schools and districts. PRISM is currently delivering a significant amount of professional development to Kentucky's teachers and is creating regional networks in conjunction with the RSCs.

Kentucky used its first-year Goals 2000 funds to support professional development initiatives. In year two, funding was used to support integrated systemic reform that incorporates technology, parental involvement, and communications strategies and links professional development to student achievement. Projects initiated in year one, including a professional development project in Franklin County that trains teachers to recruit parents as classroom volunteers, continue to receive support.

Another popular initiative partially underwritten by foundation funds and also eligible for funding under Kentucky's Goals 2000 is the Kentucky Collaborative for Elementary Learning. Through this collaborative, over 3,000 teachers have been trained in *Different Ways of Knowing* (DWoK), a program developed by the Galef Institute. DWoK is a three-year teacher professional development program in support of an interdisciplinary curriculum that was designed for grades K-6 but is being extended to grades 7-8. Approximately 300 Kentucky schools are using DWoK to some degree. In addition, the University of Louisville, Eastern Kentucky University, and Murray State University are using DWoK in their elementary teacher preparation programs.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The 1996-97 funding for professional development is \$14.5 million—or, \$23 per ADA to the districts and approximately \$2 per ADA to the

SEA—for statewide initiatives. This dramatic increase from \$1 per ADA in 1990-91 occurred over several stages. RSCs are also state-funded, and their 1996-97 allocation totaled \$2.15 million. CIT activities are funded by an annual state appropriation of \$125,000.

Federal Funds. Kentucky receives funds from several federal sources that are either specifically targeted for, or are available to support, professional development. Funding sources include School-to-Work, IDEA, Title I, and Title II Eisenhower programs. Title II Eisenhower funds target professional development, particularly in mathematics and science, and support numerous local district and special state-level initiatives for training. In 1994-95, Title II provided \$2.9 million to Kentucky; in 1995-96 it provided \$3.3 million and, in 1996-97, \$3.6 million. Kentucky received Goals 2000 funds totaling \$1.4 million in 1994-95, \$5.7 million in 1995-96, and \$5.5 million in 1996-97. The Goals 2000 program includes professional development as a primary component of competitive funding, and subgrants are made available to local districts to support these efforts.

Local Funds. Some local districts provide additional support for professional development. One local initiative that preceded current education reform efforts is the Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS)/Gheens Academy in Louisville, which was created to increase local capacity for change. JCPS, Kentucky's largest school district, recognized the advantage of "unlocking" the knowledge and expertise of the teachers and staff in its over 100 schools and of creating a network of learners.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Kentucky's legislature has appropriated funds specifically for professional development, with the clear intention that decisions regarding professional development be made at the school level. Sixty-five percent of the money generated by a school's ADA is designated for use by the school

council. By regulation, no more than 15 percent of a district's professional development funds can be used for administrative purposes.

Each school and district must establish a professional development committee which is responsible for developing and overseeing the implementation of locally-sponsored professional development (teacher participation is required on these committees). Through its RSCs and a peer review process, the state assures that all schools have engaged in active planning for professional development and that professional development plans meet the following six standards: (1) there is a clear statement of the school or district mission; (2) all persons affected by the professional development plan have been represented; (3) a needs assessment analysis has been conducted; (4) the focus of professional development objectives is on the school or district mission and on issues derived from the needs assessment; (5) the design of the professional development program and implementation strategies supports school or district goals and objectives; and (6) there is a process for evaluating and improving professional development experiences. Data on the types of activities in which schools are engaged, as well as evaluation data, are collected.

The state requires that four days be set aside for teacher professional development and that each teacher receive at least 24 hours of training annually. However, there is flexibility in how this requirement is met. Teachers may participate in school or district professional development during the school year, or they may satisfy the requirement on their own time, through summer coursework, for example.

Over the past four years, KERA has allowed five additional, optional days for professional development to be taken from instructional time. This policy was not extended beyond 1995-96, primarily due to concerns over the loss of teacher instructional time in the classroom. Both the Kentucky Education Association (KEA) and the Prichard Committee, a citizens group working in support of

improved educational opportunities, support legislative packages that include more paid professional development days for teachers. They recommend five and ten days, respectively.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Few districts in Kentucky engage in collective bargaining. In those that do, some contracts include professional development time and/or stipends, as well as tuition reimbursement packages. Reimbursement for professional development expenses—for example, conference registration, travel, and materials—is a fairly standard practice. Stipends for summer training or weekend activities vary by district. Teacher salary increments are accrued through the state certification ranking system and are based on graduate credits and degrees earned.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The KEA has taken a lead role in providing peer teaching and coaching. With financial assistance from the Prichard Committee, the KEA has established a network of teacher trainers, mentors, and coaches, called T2 (Teachers Helping Teachers). Approximately 500 teachers are available to provide "peer assistance" on demand; during the 1995-96 school year, formal requests numbered over 200. It is believed that a significant amount of informal networking occurred as well.

The University of Louisville has recently initiated ten professional development schools. Students in their teacher preparation programs will spend time at these sites observing outstanding practice, developing teaching skills with support from school and university faculty, and engaging in action research projects. In addition, a K-12 laboratory school is operating at Eastern Kentucky University.

Contacts/Information Resources

Tom Peterson
Director
Division of Professional Development
Kentucky Department of Education
500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-2672

Betty Lindsey
Associate Commissioner
Office of Teacher Certification
Kentucky Department of Education
500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-573-4606, x250

Linda Hargan
Executive Director
Kentucky Collaborative for Elementary Learning
1930 Bishop Lane, Suite 403
Louisville, KY 40218
502-451-3131

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Louisiana

Number of Teachers: 46,913

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 31%

Average Salary: \$26,243¹

Education Policy Context

Louisiana has a K-12 public education system that consists of 66 local school districts and that enrolls approximately 775,000 students. Attempts are currently underway to change the state's public education system from a state-regulated, top-down structure to a local control model. The goal is to loosen regulations on system inputs in favor of more local accountability for outputs (i.e., student performance). In addition to this proposed performance-based system, Louisiana is revising other education policies. In June of 1995, for example, Louisiana's legislature enacted pilot charter schools legislation; two charter schools are expected to open by the fall of 1996, and another three are scheduled to open in the fall of 1997.

In 1986, the state won a land grant settlement case against the federal government and used the proceeds to create the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund 8(g) for Elementary and Secondary Education. Despite these resources, the average salaries of Louisiana's teachers, determined by a state salary schedule, remain among the lowest in the nation. Current Governor Mike Foster has made a commitment to increase teacher salaries to match the southern regional average by the year 2000. Per-pupil expenditure, estimated at \$4,160 in 1992-93, also ranks below the

national average. However, a school finance lawsuit has prompted the state's Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) to adopt a new minimum funding formula.

The Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) is a statewide mandated testing program. In May of 1995, the BESE approved a five-year plan to develop statewide content standards. The Louisiana Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is overseeing the development of standards for mathematics, science, English/language arts, social studies, the arts, and foreign languages. The new content standards will reflect higher-order thinking skills, as endorsed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and other national subject-matter groups. LEAP will be revised to align with the new, more rigorous standards.

With the support of Goals 2000 funding, the Louisiana Education Achievement and Results Now (LEARN) for the 21st Century initiative is developing a comprehensive plan for school improvement. In the fall of 1994, Goals 2000 task force groups were formed and worked for 18 months to develop recommendations in seven program areas, including professional development. A 23-member LEARN commission, created in March of 1996, is reviewing these recommendations and devising a state plan that will include timelines for

the development and implementation of new standards, assessments, and the school-based accountability system.

The State Role in Professional Development

In the summer of 1995, the Professional Development Coordination Team composed of staff from 12 SEA departments was established to design a systemic plan for state-sponsored professional development. The Team composed the following mission statement and working definition of professional development:

"The mission of professional development is to prepare and support educators to help all students achieve high standards of learning and development."

"Professional development is a continuous process to advance knowledge, skills, and behaviors for individuals and groups within the learning organization. Professional development includes high-quality ongoing training programs with intensive follow-up and support, study groups, action research and peer coaching."

Incorporating standards from the National Staff Development Council and the U.S. Department of Education's

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Professional Development Team, the SEA has endorsed the following principles, which state that professional development should:

- focus on teachers as central to school reform, yet include all members of the school community;
- respect and nurture the intellectual capacity of teachers and others in the community;
- reflect the best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership;
- be planned principally by those who will participate in such development;
- enable teachers to develop expertise in content, pedagogy, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards;
- require ample time and other resources that enable educators to develop their individual capacity to learn and work together;
- promote commitment to continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools;
- be driven by a coherent long-term plan that incorporates professional development as essential among a broad set of strategies to improved teaching and learning; and
- be evaluated on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness, student learning, leadership, and the school community and use the assessment to guide subsequent professional development efforts.

Teacher Certification Policies. Beginning teachers receive a Type C (regular) Certificate. As a result of state legislation passed in June of 1994, full-time teachers hired by Louisiana's public schools are now required to participate in the Louisiana Teacher Assessment Program during their first year of employment. For new teachers who are

employed without a regular certificate, its issuance is conditional on the successful completion of the Teacher Assessment Program.

The Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching, adopted in February of 1992, describe effective teaching behaviors for beginning and experienced teachers. The components serve as evaluation criteria for the Louisiana Teacher Assessment Program and for local teacher evaluations. They focus on four domains of teaching: planning, management, instruction, and professional development.

The Louisiana Teacher Assessment Program is used during the first semester of a teacher's employment to provide support and strategies for professional development. During the second semester, the assessment is used to collect data that will be used by the teacher's assessors to recommend either permanent certification or continuation for a second year in the assessment program. Beginning teachers are assigned a three-member support team that is responsible for conducting the assessment. Support team members, who are state-trained, consist of the new teacher's immediate supervisor (usually the school principal or an assistant principal), a peer-nominated and experienced teacher in the new teacher's school, and an external (i.e., central office, retired educator, or college faculty) assessor. Each assessor conducts a minimum of one visit to a new teacher's classroom during each semester of the assessment year. During the first semester, or the support semester, new teachers attend a state-designed assessment orientation and participate in professional development activities. At the conclusion of each semester, a jointly designed professional development plan is created for the new teacher, who is then responsible for its implementation. Teachers have up to two years to successfully complete the assessment program.

After successful completion of the assessment and three years of experience, teachers receive a Type B (permanent) Certificate. Louisiana does not have recertification requirements; however, Type B teachers must participate in a local evaluation at least every three

years and implement a professional growth plan based on evaluation findings.

State-Supported Programs. Most statewide, non-categorical professional development is coordinated through the eight state-funded Regional Service Centers (RSCs). The RSCs coordinate assessor training and new teacher orientation for the Teacher Assessment Program.

The Professional Development Coordination Team developed and distributed a 1995-96 catalogue of SEA-sponsored professional development. Catalogue listings are structured under six headings: (1) SEA-conducted voluntary in-service activities; (2) RSC-conducted voluntary in-service activities; (3) mandated professional development; (4) state and national conferences; (5) on-site monitoring activities; and (6) professional development services available upon request. Each listing provides the in-service program name, activity description, contact person and phone number, location, target audience, and program length. The coordination team distributed a survey to parish administrators to solicit feedback on the usefulness of the catalogue, which SEA plans to publish annually. In addition, the team plans to conduct a series of regional focus groups with teachers, administrators, and parents to hear their views on professional development needs.

Through its Bureau of Effective Schools, the SEA is working to establish a state chapter of the National Staff Development Council. Over 100 educators from across the state attended the first Louisiana Staff Development Council (LSDC) meeting, held on February 22, 1996. The SEA focused its July, 1996, Title I Conference on staff development. The LSDC hopes to be officially approved as a state affiliate by December of 1996.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. Louisiana's Goals 2000 subgrant program targets three reform areas: school improvement, professional development, and preservice. Awarded on a competitive basis, the subgrants provide fiscal and other support to parishes, local consortia, colleges and universi-

ties, and non-profit organizations. Goals 2000 professional development subgrants "enable schools/parishes to work collaboratively to design and implement plans that provide continuing, sustained professional development for educators and related services personnel that will lead to long-range systemic reform and result in improved student learning." Grant recipients receive up to \$20,000 for planning and \$60,000 for implementation. In 1994-95, 31 school systems (47 percent of all parishes) received funding for professional development planning and implementation. During the 1995-96 school year, four professional development planning and eight implementation subgrants were awarded to 12 local parishes.

The Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP) was initiated in 1991 through a five-year, Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation, with additional funding from the BESE and Board of Regents (BOR). LaSIP has promoted standards-based curriculum reform in grades 4-8 in mathematics and science. Approximately 70 percent of LaSIP's \$20-million budget has been used to implement a professional development model that consists of intensive and content-rich summer work, academic-year follow-up, and an on-site school/university professional development coordinator. Teachers receive a \$60-per-day stipend to attend summer workshops and \$300 to purchase instructional materials during the school year. All 66 Louisiana parishes are involved in this initiative, and over 4,000 teachers have each received 150 to 200 contact hours of training and technical assistance through LaSIP's professional development projects.

Publi : Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Since 1992, the state-supported Innovative Professional Development Program has made funds available for local professional development. For 1996-97, the BESE allocated \$1.7 million in 8(g) funds for this initiative. The state also allocates \$2.1

million per year for the Teacher Tuition Exemption Program (see "Teacher Compensation"). The state-funded Teachers Assessment Program costs totaled \$5.4 million in 1995-96.

Federal Funds. Twelve Goals 2000 professional development subgrants were awarded in 1995-96, totaling \$503,328. LaSIP activities are funded by a \$10-million SSI grant and a matching annual state 8(g) fund allocation of \$500,000, as well as an additional \$500,000 from the BOR. Louisiana received a \$5.6-million Eisenhower grant in 1995-96.

Local Funds. Parish-sponsored professional development is funded through local budgets, although costs for certain activities may be eligible for state reimbursement (see below).

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Each parish is required to implement the Teacher Assessment Program according to state guidelines. Local parishes must also conduct annual teacher evaluations based on effective teaching competencies and provide opportunities for the implementation of teachers' professional growth plans. The school accreditation process requires teachers to participate in six hours of professional growth activities every five years.

Local systems can apply for state professional development funds through the Innovative Professional Development Program. In order to receive funds through this initiative, parishes are required to submit to the BESE an application that includes a program description and a line-item budget and to complete an evaluation process. Successful applications must show that the professional development activity is specifically designed to improve student academic achievement and/or vocational skills development. Parishes must include school-level personnel in the development of the application.

Innovative Professional Development Program funds can be used to pay for credit and non-credit courses or workshops that focus on the following

themes: innovative curriculum and instruction, human development and learning, instructional technology, school improvement, language and literacy, school and classroom management, legal and ethical issues, and cultural diversity. Non-credit training expenses may not exceed an amount equal to \$6 per teacher, per hour. Expenses eligible for reimbursement include tuition fees, instructor and speaker fees, participant stipends, substitute pay, operating expenses, and travel. Colleges and universities, the SEA, and public and non-public schools are also eligible to receive funds for professional development through this program. Eligible agencies are allowed to request funding for up to ten projects per year, not to exceed a total cost of \$100,000. The BESE accepts and reviews applications monthly. BESE compliance officers conduct on-site audits of all funded projects.

The school year calendar consists of 175 instructional and five discretionary days. Most parishes earmark at least two discretionary days for professional development.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Advancement on the state salary schedule is awarded for obtaining a master's degree, a master's plus 30 graduate credits, an Education Specialist degree, and a doctoral degree.

Started in 1987, the Teacher Tuition Exemption Program is an 8(g)-funded initiative that pays teachers' college tuition for up to four courses over two consecutive years. In order to take advantage of this program, teachers must submit an approved application; take courses in their certified content area, area of job assignment, and/or designated critical shortage areas; and receive a grade of C or better. The tuition payment is made directly to participating colleges and universities.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Louisiana Education Association (LEA) sponsors an annual Instruction and Professional Development Conference held in September. The conference is structured as a two-day, theme-based teacher training event that consists of 15 to 20 workshops. LEA members, as well as non-members, may attend the conference, which attracts an estimated 300 teachers annually. LEA's annual convention is held over three days in November. Schools are closed during the convention, and over 200 teachers regularly attend the event. Teachers receive one semester hour of credit for every two hours of participation in LEA professional development. These credits may be used towards fulfillment of school accreditation requirements.

Contacts/Information Resources

Barbara Dunbar
Education Executive Administrator
Administrative Leadership Academy
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
504-342-3483

Diane Garbo
Assistant Director
Bureau of Higher Education and
Teacher Certification
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
504-342-3501

Marie Weiss
Assistant Bureau Director
Bureau of Professional Accountability
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
504-342-1146

Reports and Publications

"Professional Development: What Is It? What Should It Look Like?," *Professional Development* newsletter; volume 1, issue 1; Louisiana Department of Education (September 28, 1995).

Professional Development Activities Catalogue: 1995-96; Louisiana Department of Education, Office of Academic Programs.

Louisiana Components of Effective Teaching; position paper of Panel 1; The Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (September 1992).

Strategies for Effective Teaching: A Professional Development Manual - Louisiana Teacher Assessment Program 1994-95; Office of Research and Development, Bureau of Professional Accountability; Louisiana Department of Education.

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Maine

Number of Teachers: 15,344
 Average Years of Experience: 15
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 28%
 Average Salary: \$30,996¹

Education Policy Context

Maine is largely a rural state with a school-age population of 216,995 enrolled in its 285 school systems. Maine's school systems have strong local control over public education; most policies that impact teacher professional development are set at the district level.

In 1990, the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted the Common Core of Learning (CCL), which presents a non-disciplinary organization of knowledge and skills and an integrated approach to teaching and learning. The CCL sets state educational goals in the areas of personal and global stewardship, communication, reasoning and problem solving, and the human record. It was developed to serve as the basis for education reform in Maine. According to a report issued by the Maine Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA), approximately 43 percent of Maine's school systems were involved in school restructuring, guided by the CCL, in 1992.

In 1993, legislation was passed that established a Learning Results Task Force. The Task Force was charged with establishing broad outlines for student performance standards and also serves as Maine's Goals 2000 panel. The SBE developed specific recommendations based on the Task Force's broadly

outlined standards and presented them to the legislature during the January-March of 1996 session. The legislation was passed in June of 1996, despite strong opposition.

The SBE, the SEA, and the University of Maine system, along with the Maine Leadership Consortium, have been working together to create a results-based model of initial teacher certification based on the CCL. They are implementing a three-part strategy to develop this model. Three partnerships between colleges and local districts were funded to develop and pilot new standards and approaches to certification. Five additional sites are piloting the proposed standards, which are closely related to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) guidelines. Finally, a series of meetings outlining their findings was held. Based on these activities, the state intends to establish an advisory committee to work on initial certification legislation.

The State Role in Professional Development

Maine is currently setting standards for students and new educators. Professional development is considered to be an integral part of implementing education reform in Maine, and staff from the Governor's Office, the SBE, and the

Western Maine Partnership are working on a state plan for professional development. In addition, Maine is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. In 1988, the state turned the teacher certification process over to local districts, which are now required by the state to establish committees that oversee beginning and continuing educator certification. Local certification committees can determine whether or not a new teacher will be granted a professional certificate and can approve or not approve professional development activities. They may also suggest areas in which continuing educators should improve. In Maine, each local certification committee is responsible for ensuring that all district educators are certified. In some districts, the certification committees are elected, and in others they are appointed by the superintendent.

Beginning teachers receive a two-year probationary contract and work with a professional support team for a minimum of 18 months. The support team is responsible for providing guidance for new teachers and overseeing the induction process. In addition, the inclusion of professional development

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

activities during the induction period is left to the discretion of the support teams. These teams help the new teacher develop an action plan with a mentor. If the teacher completes the plan after two years, the certification committee will recommend that the he or she receive a professional certificate. While the state has set certain competencies for beginning teachers, the local certification teams determine whether or not a teacher is eligible for a professional certificate. After initial licenses are approved, all educators in Maine must take a three-credit, state-approved college course on special needs children.

Professional certificates are renewable every five years. To renew a professional certificate, a teacher must develop a professional development plan, which is approved by the local certification committee, and they must complete six credit hours or 90 clock hours of professional development activities during the five-year period. These activities can include workshops, serving on committees, and college coursework. Those renewing professional certificates, but not employed under that certificate, must complete six credits of approved study and renew directly through the SEA.

Master teacher certificates are available in Maine, although there are only a few teachers in the state who currently hold this level of certification. Teachers who have at least two years of classroom experience and demonstrate involvement in curricular and professional development activities are eligible to become master teachers. Teachers seeking this credential work with a support team for a minimum of 18 months. The support team assists in the development and completion of an action plan. The process is similar to the initial teacher certification process.

As discussed above, Maine is in the process of developing preservice standards for new educators that, when fully implemented, may have a broad impact on the state's certification and recertification system.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA does not have an office dedicated specifically to professional development programming or policy. The Office of

Certification and Placement is responsible for issuing teaching certificates, although the decision to grant recertification to educators is made by local certification committees for teachers already employed in Maine schools. The decision to grant certification for all others is determined by the Office of Certification and Placement.

The state hosts workshops on reform-related topics, specifically on the CCL and on standards-based education. Teachers are not required to participate in any state-sponsored workshops. The SEA hires consultants who provide technical assistance to schools that are restructuring based on the CCL and those that need special education assistance. Schools working directly with the SEA to restructure receive a great deal of technical assistance from that agency.

The Maine Leadership Consortium is trying to raise awareness of the importance of teacher professional development in implementing reform. The group represents 20 organizations involved in education throughout the state, which in turn represent over 30,000 educators, parents, business representatives, and other citizens. The Leadership Consortium includes state government organizations such as the SEA and the Maine School Management Association, as well as the University of Maine system, the Maine Education Association, various administrative organizations, and the Maine Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Its overall goal is to improve working relationships and communication within the education community and to establish a policy agenda for Maine's education system.

The Leadership Consortium issued a report in 1993 that outlined five major policy areas for reform: learning results, accountability, opportunity to learn, goals-based professional development for educators, and equitable state funding. The Leadership Consortium advocates reforming the existing system and has recommended that the state "take leadership and provide policies and funding to ensure that systemic, state-wide goals-based professional development is a central feature of continuing school improvement." To

date, however, no state action has been taken to provide increased funding for teacher professional development.

The Leadership Consortium helps to maintain a teacher professional development calendar, which is accessible over the Internet, through a joint project with the Information Exchange at the Maine State Library. The group also has convened providers of teacher professional development to discuss statewide professional development needs and to help coordinate the provision of programs across the state.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The state is participating in the federally sponsored Goals 2000 initiative, which supports education reform efforts in Maine, particularly in the area of teacher professional development. Professional development plans must be included in the school improvement plans required by the Goals 2000 grants process.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) awarded Maine a grant to reform math and science education. The Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant is administered by the Maine Math and Science Alliance, a non-profit organization created by the state in 1992 for this purpose. Its advisory board includes members of state government, the business community, the Maine Math Teachers Association, and the Maine Science Teachers Association, as well as other representatives. Its mission is the systemic improvement of math and science education from pre-kindergarten through graduate school. One of the Alliance's components is a Professional Preparation and Development Committee that is responsible for year-long staff development institutes and the development of a Beacon College to ensure educators have access to "world-class" math and science teacher education. The Maine SSI also supports demonstration schools, which offer professional development in their region and sponsor summer institutes.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There are no state funds set aside in the education budget

specifically for professional development activities. Maine allocated between \$8,000 and \$15,000 to each of the pilot districts testing new certification requirements. The first three sites were funded for three years; however, new sites may only be funded for one year.

Federal Funds. Goals 2000 funds are used to support professional development in districts, local school improvement efforts, and teacher-prepared activities. In FY 1996, Maine received \$1.3 million from Goals 2000. The state also received Eisenhower funds that support professional development in mathematics and science.

Local Funds. Local districts are not required to spend a minimum percentage of their budgets on teacher professional development activities. However, they do support professional development through their general state allocation. If a school district spends money on professional development, they are reimbursed by the state on a sliding scale. Over the past five years, school districts in Maine have reportedly lost over \$500,000 in state funding, and only 25 percent of this figure was regained through increases in local property taxes. This financial crunch has seriously weakened the ability of districts that are more dependent on state aid to provide professional development for their teachers.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required to establish certification committees that oversee professional development plans for individual educators. Under Goals 2000, districts must develop districtwide staff development plans as part of their school improvement plans. The state allows districts to release students for five days for various activities, although the time does not have to be used for professional development. There is no minimum number of days required for professional development activities. Many districts have a 175-day instructional year with five free days for professional development or other activities.

The process of choosing topics for in-service days and staff development providers varies greatly from district to district. In some districts, teacher input is solicited, while in others the central office may select topics and providers without school-level input.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Maine's teachers can and do bargain for professional development on a district-by-district basis. The amount and type of professional development negotiated varies greatly by district.

Local districts reimburse teachers for college courses; however the amount of reimbursement varies by district. Teachers are also given salary increments or step increases for experience and degrees earned.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Maine Education Association provides teacher professional development for its members and participates in state-level stakeholders meetings regarding state reform.

Universities are a major provider of teacher professional development services through college courses. Universities are also helping to shape policy at the state level and organizing regional networks of school districts in order to provide professional development. The University of Maine system stands out as a key player in this regard. As mentioned earlier, the University of Maine system is very involved with education policy in the state, particularly in the standards-setting area.

The University of Maine system also provides professional development for teachers through four regional partnerships with districts: the Southern Maine Partnership (at the University of Southern Maine), the Western Maine Partnership (at University of Maine, Farmington), the Washington County Partnership, and the Penquis Partnership (a research partnership involving the University of Maine that includes 24

local school districts). Each partnership offers a range of professional development opportunities. Some provide specific workshops that bring in outside experts. Others, like the Western Maine partnership, offer professional development using "reflective practice groups" hosted by a facilitator. The state supports these partnerships with federal grant money and special education funds. Another partnership effort, the Maine Principals Association Research Partnership, is a collaboration of University of Maine research faculty and principals in local schools that is undertaking a great deal of "action" research.

The Southern Maine Partnership is a school-university collaboration representing 27 public school districts, three private schools, the Maine College of Art, the Southern Maine Technical College, and the University of Southern Maine. The Partnership has built a reputation as an organization that respects the professional knowledge of educators and nurtures teachers' potential as inventors and change agents. It provides a forum where ideas are exchanged, where university and public school faculty inform and enrich one another's practice, and where educational research is examined through the lens of daily school experience. The Partnership sponsors different projects in member schools and districts. These include: Assessment Mini-Grants, the Demonstration Schools Project, and School Quality Review. It is also affiliated with the Coalition of Essential Schools, the Foxfire National Outreach Network, the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), and the National Education Association's Center for Innovation. The Partnership has achieved regional, statewide, and national reputation as a center for school-based, educator-driven school reform. Partnership activities are supported through annual dues, in-kind contributions from the University of Southern Maine, and outside grants and gifts from private foundations.

The Professional Development Center (PDC) is a staff development agent and resource for the College of Educa-

tion and Human Development (CEHD) of the University of Southern Maine (USM) and for the education community at large. The PDC works collaboratively with the Southern Maine Partnership, K-12 schools, human resources organizations, the SEA, and professional associations. The PDC develops, implements, and administers credit and non-credit courses, workshops, and institutes at USM and community locations to supplement and expand professional development. During the school year, the PDC conducts technical assistance and training programs designed to meet the specific needs of individual Maine school districts. These programs may offer recertification credits (continuing education units) or in-service academic credit. Past course offerings have included writing workshops, curriculum unit design, and instruction of language-learning-disabled and special needs students. During the summer, the PDC sponsors special courses and institutes for educators throughout Maine. One program is Math Solutions, a week-long course for K-12 teachers taught by faculty from across the nation. Dimensions of Learning is another program administered by the PDC. It provides a comprehensive K-12 instructional framework that teachers use to improve the way they plan instruction, design curriculum, and assess student performance.

Another well-known USM program is the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP). ETEP serves 60 to 90 teachers each year, providing courses in pedagogy and student teaching experiences to new professionals who have completed required academic work, but are in need of further professional training. ETEP is a college-based program, and students apply and pay tuition. With the addition of six credits, the ETEP program can lead to a master's degree.

Known throughout Maine as "the Center," the Center for Educational Services is a private organization that provides support for school improvement activities, including professional

development, to public and private schools. It also works closely with the state on certain initiatives. The Center is located in Auburn and has been in existence since 1975.

Contacts/Information Resources

Nancy Ibarguen
Director of Certification and Placement
Maine Department of Education
23 Statehouse Station
Augusta, ME 04333
207-287-4461

Nancy Hensel
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Maine at Farmington
86 Main Street
Farmington, ME 04938
207-778-7279

Tim Humphrey
Director
Maine Education Association
35 Community Drive
Augusta, ME 04330
207-622-5866, ext. 320

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Maryland

Number of Teachers: 44,171**Average Years of Experience: 15****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 50%****Average Salary: \$39,475¹**

Education Policy Context

Maryland ranks 42nd in size and 19th in population among the 50 states, and approximately 82 percent of the state's five million residents live in the Baltimore-Washington corridor. There are 24 school districts in the state—23 county systems and the Baltimore City district—serving nearly 800,000 students.

Maryland has undergone a series of steps in its education reform efforts, beginning in 1989 with the report of the Governor's Commission on School Performance. The State Board of Education (SBE) then developed "Schools for Success," a comprehensive statewide school improvement strategy aligned with the national education goals. The linchpin of this plan is the Maryland School Performance Program (MSPP), an accountability system that "assesses school performance, measures school progress toward state standards, [and] intervenes, ultimately, in schools that fail to improve." The reform agenda in Maryland is guided by three basic principles: (1) all children can learn; (2) all children have the right to attend schools in which they can progress and learn; and (3) all children will have a real opportunity to learn equally rigorous content.

The development of the Schools for Success/Goals 2000 State Plan was guided by a broad-based, 54-member

panel. The 86-page Goals 2000 report (augmented by a 20-page technology report) released in May of 1995 has served as the basis for continued planning and development. One of the panel's subcommittees—Teacher Training, Certification, and Staff Development—addressed the issue of teacher professional development in general and, specifically, its role within the context of the Schools for Success reform plan. Teacher professional development is seen as one of the cornerstones of the Schools for Success program.

Since 1989, four major statewide initiatives that support the MSPP have been launched. First, content and performance standards for schools, school systems, and the state were established, and content standards in reading, writing, language usage, mathematics, science, and social studies were defined for students in grades 3, 5, and 8. State curriculum frameworks were developed, providing guidelines for the schools and districts. Second, the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), a series of state-developed criterion-referenced tests, administered to students in grades 3, 5, and 8, was initiated to measure schools' progress. Third, in 1994, Maryland began the process of developing a high school assessment system to complement the MSPAP assessment tests. Once developed, the high school as-

sessments will be used to determine student achievement, with the compilation of student scores complementing the MSPAP information about a school's progress. Finally, each school, each system, and the state issue annual "report cards" to communicate with the public. The report cards contain demographic information, assessment results, and other data, such as attendance and dropout rates, as well as high school completion information. The MSPP requires every school to establish a school improvement team, which develops and implements a school improvement plan.

The State Role in Professional Development

The success of the MSPP clearly hinges on the extent to which Maryland's schools are able to improve their instructional programs. State officials recognize the challenges this presents to teacher candidates as well as practicing teachers. In 1991, a task force was created to recommend a comprehensive plan for educating teachers, both in the preparation stage and as practitioners. The task force's work focused on teacher preparation. A second task force was created to determine the specifics of implementing the teacher preparation recommendations and to address the continuing professional development of teachers.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Recently, the SBE requested that a strategic plan for staff development be written. A 30-plus member Staff Development Task Force was established and co-chaired by leaders from the Maryland Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) and the Maryland Business Roundtable. The Task Force created a vision for staff development in Maryland, "Supporting Schools for Success," which states

"Staff development enables all those involved in educating Maryland students to be active partners in a learning community. This learning community sets the standard for best staff development practices by forming a bridge between educational goals and student achievement."

The vision addresses leadership, resources, support systems, strategic alliance partners, best practices, educational goals, and student achievement. The work of the Task Force was recently completed, and three recommendations were made to the SBE. They asked the SBE to:

1. implement effective professional development practices linked to improved student performance across Maryland;
2. examine and realign existing support systems—time, money, technology, staffing, performance feedback, and accountability—to create a culture that encourages and sustains effective professional development; and,
3. provide visible leadership and advocacy for professional development.

In addition, Maryland is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Professional Standards and Teacher Education Board (PSTEB) is appointed

by the governor and has the authority to enact requirements regarding teacher licensure (although the SBE has 60 days to override the PSTEB's decisions). Prior to January of 1995, recertification was automatic for any teacher holding an advanced professional certificate. New requirements for licensure established five types of certification (see below). In addition, the Teacher Education Task Force issued its report entitled, "Redesign of Teacher Education in Maryland: Report of the Teacher Education Task Force" in June of 1994. Report recommendations include using the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards and the "Essential Dimensions of Teaching" standards developed by committees of Maryland educators to revise existing requirements for teacher preparation programs and candidate assessment.

Maryland's current system of teacher licensure includes the following certificates:

- The Professional Eligibility Certificate, valid for five years, is granted to candidates who have completed an approved program and teacher certification testing requirements. It can be renewed after completing six semester hours or by entering the professional certificate sequence upon being hired.
- The Standard Professional I Certificate is valid for three years and is based on the same requirements as the Professional Eligibility Certificate, but the individual must be employed in a Maryland school. The certificate is renewable only once, if the applicant completes six semester hours but is unable to meet the experience requirement for the Standard Professional II Certificate.
- The Standard Professional II Certificate is valid for seven years, requires a completed Standard Professional I Certificate, three years of satisfactory professional school-related experience (two of which are consecutive), six semester hours, and participation in a professional

development plan for the Advanced Professional Certificate.

- An Extended Standard Professional II Certificate is valid for three years and is granted to those individuals with a Standard Professional II Certificate who complete six semester hours but whose service was interrupted during the validity period.
- The Advanced Professional Certificate is valid for five years and is granted to individuals eligible for the Standard Professional Certificate if they have a master's degree or 36 semester hours of post-baccalaureate work and four years of satisfactory school-related experience (two of which are consecutive) within seven years preceding the date of Advanced Professional Certificate issuance. Renewal requirements include a professional development plan for the next Advanced Professional Certificate, consisting of six semester hours or their equivalent through other professional activities (e.g., pursuit of National Board Certification, curriculum development, and research activities) as determined by the local school board.

Maryland also offers Provisional Certificates, which allow districts that cannot find a qualified, credentialed teacher in a given subject or specialty area to hire an individual with a bachelor's degree who agrees to work toward a regular credential. The individual may renew the Provisional Certificate as long as six semester hours are completed each year, until requirements for the Standard Professional Certification are met. The Resident Teacher Certificate Program is open to an individual with a bachelor's degree, a "B" average in the major, passing scores on the National Teacher Exam, and a contract with an employing district for a K-12 teaching position. Candidates take 90 hours of designated professional education courses and teach with support from a supervising teacher/mentor.

State-Supported Programs.

Maryland's SEA provides School Improvement Leadership Training and technical assistance to school improvement teams and site administrators in low-achieving schools. The training emphasizes interpreting data, using it to make instructional decisions, and working more effectively in teams. The SEA is also establishing and training Technical Assistance Support Teams (TASTs) in each local school system. Training includes topics such as how to interpret data and use it in a school improvement plan, as well as how to help groups work more effectively in teams. Training is also available to School Improvement Teams (SITs) on the same topics. Twenty-nine schools have been identified as Challenge Schools, which confers additional state dollars that are targeted to assist with school improvement efforts. A portion of these funds supports training for SITs and training for state assistance teams, which are comprised of members of the business community, the SEA, and local school systems.

Four state-funded Regional Staff Development Centers (RSDCs) help school staff and administration implement school-based decision making. These centers serve nine school systems on the Eastern Shore, the Baltimore and Prince George's County metropolitan areas, and the four school systems in Western Maryland. The three primary areas of focus are SIT development, promising practices, and parent/community involvement. The state plans to expand RSDCs and to shift their focus to staff development for high school assessment.

Since 1989, approximately 800 teachers have been trained in advanced math and science content and methodology at the Governor's Academy for Mathematics, Science, and Technology. The Academy offers an intensive four-week summer program, after which teachers return to their home schools as ambassadors who motivate and instruct other teachers, as well as their own students. Issues of equity for traditionally under-represented minority and female students are addressed in this program.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported

Programs. The Schools for Success/Goals 2000 process included subgrants to local school systems and consortia of local school systems. Each proposal was required to include professional development activities for teachers, principals, and other educators, and/or activities to improve preservice teacher education and school administration programs. Subgrants awarded in 1995-96 reflected 60 percent of the money received by Maryland. In 1996-97, 12 school systems received individual subgrants, and a consortium of all 24 school systems received funding. Goals 2000 funds also supported assessment design and scoring, as well as curriculum development activities that involved more than 3,000 teachers. In Anne Arundel County, Prince George's County, and Baltimore City, funds supported a partnership with community colleges and universities to provide targeted professional development for district teachers.

The Carnegie Corporation has provided funding to ten low-performing middle schools to assist with reforms in school organization, management, curriculum, classroom practices, teacher education, and links with resources outside the school. This initiative, the Carnegie Middle Schools Project, provides resources and assistance to help meet the needs of the students, both within the school and in the larger community.

Baltimore City Public Schools received an Urban System Initiative (USI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) which provides substantial funds for professional development in mathematics and science instruction.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Maryland currently budgets \$600,000 to support the RSDCs. Districts do not receive a state-funded allocation specifically for professional development.

Federal Funds. Maryland received a Goals 2000 grant of \$1,448,309 in 1994, \$5,379,938 in 1995, and \$5,054,796 in

1996. Additionally, in 1995, Maryland was one of eight states to receive Goals 2000 leadership money for assessment development, a grant totaling \$224,000. Maryland also received \$3,122,827 in Eisenhower funds for professional development in 1995.

Local Funds. Local allocations for professional development are determined at the district level.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Since 1995, the state has mandated that every certificated educator must have a written professional development plan agreed upon by the employing district and the individual. The plans may be linked with teacher classroom performance; however, this aspect of the plan is optional. Professional development is required for licensure renewal for all certificated employees, and new guidelines redefine professional development to include a wide variety of activities. Teachers can serve as mentors to newer teachers, supervise action research, participate in local school system projects, attend professional conferences, and participate in educational travel.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Local school boards determine the compensation for their staff, most often through collective bargaining agreements. Generally, districts offer a variety of "salary lanes" through which teachers can advance their salary levels by obtaining post-baccalaureate credits and graduate degrees. Reimbursement for college tuition and other professional development activities are provided at the discretion of the district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Maryland Higher Education Commission, in collaboration with the

SEA, is providing the impetus for a new model of preservice education and continuing professional development. Regional Professional Development Schools (PDSs), operated by consortia of local school districts and universities, will provide the continuum of service and support for both beginning and veteran teachers.

The Center for Technology in Education is a joint project of the SEA and Johns Hopkins University. The purpose of the project is to provide technical support to educators to aid the growth and development of students with disabilities, as well as to help families of children with disabilities. The Center also supports the management of systemic change for school improvement through technology.

The Prince George's County Public Schools and the University of Maryland at College Park have formed a partnership to improve the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms by integrating the design principles of the ATLAS program, with an emphasis on the teaching and learning of students for whom English is a second language.

The Maryland Business Roundtable for Education, comprised of 63 of Maryland's largest employers, has made a ten-year commitment to support education reform initiatives. The Roundtable is involved in a number of projects and activities, among them, providing training and professional development to schools and school districts to strengthen the knowledge and skills needed to improve student achievement. In addition, the Roundtable is co-chairing the work of the Staff Development Task Force, offering expertise and resources.

Contacts/Information Resources

Gaye Brown
Chief of Staff Development Branch
Maryland State Department of
Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0381

Richard Steinke
Deputy State Superintendent
School Improvement Services
Maryland State Department of
Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0229

Janet Marsh
Chief
Certification Branch
Maryland State Department of
Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0406

Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Massachusetts

Number of Teachers: 58,766

Average Years of Experience: 18

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 55%

Average Salary: \$38,960¹

Education Policy Context

Massachusetts enrolls more than 900,000 students in its 331 school districts. A strong sense of local control in the state's school systems has, at times, made exercising state-level leadership in education a difficult challenge. However, the state's role in shaping local practice and policy increased when the Education Reform Act of 1993 became law. In June of 1993, the Massachusetts Supreme Court found the state's school-financing system to be inequitable and ordered it replaced. The Education Reform Act of 1993 dedicated over \$2 billion in new state and local funding to support the reforms from 1993 to 2000. The Act has five primary goals: establishing standards for student outcomes; ensuring equitable funding; creating a system of school accountability; improving the quality of all educational personnel; and restructuring the State Education Agency (SEA) to improve its capacity for implementing reform.

Professional development for teachers has been an important topic of discussion at the state level. The Education Reform Act declares the state's intention to improve the quality and accountability of all education personnel. This covers: setting standards and regulations for personnel; a process for recertifying school person-

nel; a statewide plan for professional development and recertification; and criteria for performance standards for education personnel. Professional development is an integral part of reforming the state system of public education, with funds and personnel dedicated to this purpose. New recertification requirements for teachers have met some political resistance, but the program is proceeding, and all school personnel are subject to certificate renewal in 1999.

The State Role in Professional Development

Massachusetts is implementing a comprehensive statewide plan for professional development that incorporates the new recertification requirements, standards for professional development, and a statewide system of professional development providers. The 1995-96 State Plan for Professional Development spells out the relationship between the success of education reform and the professional development of educators, and discusses the state's role in coordinating and stimulating "local, regional, and statewide professional development programs that are focused on curriculum reform, new approaches to educational leadership, and expanding the use of technologies for educational improvement." The objectives of the state plan are:

- to provide high-quality professional development programs that are aligned with State Board of Education (SBE) priorities for educational improvement;
- to create a statewide network for professional development of school personnel;
- to establish standards for professional development programs;
- to expand district capacity to deliver high-quality professional development;
- to support reform of education preparation programs and performance-based assessment of educators;
- to maintain and enhance newly established professional development provider and recertification systems;
- to sponsor research on effective professional development practices; and
- to disseminate exemplary state practices in professional development.

The Education Reform Act of 1993 requires districts, schools, and individual educators to establish profes-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

sional development plans, which are developed and reviewed locally in accord with school and district goals. The state provides guidelines, but does not evaluate or approve the plans.

Teacher Certification Policies.

There are no mandated professional development requirements for first-year teachers in Massachusetts. The state is in the process of developing standards for the induction of new teachers. The Education Reform Act requires teacher assessment, but this provision of the law has not yet been implemented. The law also requires that districts maintain support programs for provisionally certified teachers; state standards and guidelines for these programs are now being developed.

The SBE was charged with developing the specifics of the new state recertification policy. Prior to the Education Reform Act of 1993, teachers and administrators received life-time certification. This policy has been changed to a five-year renewable certificate. Massachusetts educators are up for renewal for the first time on June 18, 1999. Massachusetts has no certificate of advanced standing at this time.

New recertification regulations require teachers to participate in professional development activities linked to their content area and focused on improving classroom instruction technique. In order to renew a teaching certificate, teachers must obtain 120 professional development "points" within the five-year period. A minimum of four hours of a topic area is necessary to qualify for any points. Different types of professional development activities earn different point amounts. For example, participating in a state-run workshop may be worth one point per clock hour for a participant, and three points per clock hour for a presenter. One one-credit university course may equal 15 points per semester hour. The state also accepts National Board Certification activities for professional development points.

The new recertification process is outlined in a state-produced guide for educators. The first step is the development an Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) that includes

the teacher's goals for strengthening practice and indicators of change for the five-year period. The recommended second step is teacher consultation with district personnel because the IPDP must support school, district, and state goals, as well as individual goals. The third step is the actual participation in professional development activities and the subsequent mailing of forms and fees. Educators must pay \$100 every five years for the standard certificate. This cost covers any number of certificates renewed at the same time; additional certificates renewed separately cost \$25.

Recertification is not currently linked to performance-based evaluation, although the Governor has advocated a recertification system based on personnel evaluation. The SBE adopted a set of "Principles of Effective Teaching and Administrative Leadership" for school districts to use as a baseline in developing their own performance evaluation standards. Districts were scheduled to submit their locally bargained performance standards to the SEA in September of 1996.

As the system now stands, continuing education units (CEUs), course credits, and other professional development units do not have to be linked to teachers' assignments. However, in order to protect their employability, the vast majority of educators are selecting the area in which they are working for their primary certificate, which becomes the focus of their professional development.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA coordinates a comprehensive program of professional development for educators that focuses on the agency's professional development goals. These well-attended workshops and institutes for teachers and administrators are funded modestly. Nearly all new money for professional development goes directly to local education agencies.

The state Professional Development Provider program registers providers who affirm that their services comply with state standards. School districts, higher education institutions, private schools, collaboratives, and non-profit and for-profit educational associations may all apply to the SEA to register as

Professional Development Providers. Providers agree to designate a contact person, affirm that they will offer high-quality professional development consistent with the "Characteristics for High Quality Professional Development" outlined below, keep records of activities for the SEA to review, and award certificates of completion for educators to submit for recertification points. The SEA offers technical assistance to help providers maintain records of their offerings and participating educators. The state compiles a catalogue of professional development providers and makes competitive grants to providers to meet perceived gaps in existing professional development offerings.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Massachusetts participates in Goals 2000 and the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiative. Massachusetts has incorporated professional development in its Goals 2000 comprehensive reform plan by awarding subgrants to districts for implementing promising professional development initiatives. The Goals 2000 grants enable districts to create Education Reform Study Groups focusing on effective classroom and school restructuring practices, development of coherent K-12 curricula, effective classroom assessments, and teacher performance standards. Districts received competitive awards in Years 1 and 2 and continuation funding in Year 3.

Boston Public Schools, the state's largest school district, has received a Challenge Grant from the Annenberg Foundation which is supporting school reform and professional development.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The Education Reform Act of 1993 included substantial funds allocated for the professional development of educators. The state's education budget contains a specific line item for professional development funds distributed to districts according to formula. In FY 1996, the professional development line item was approximately \$10 million. This amount does not include funds from other sources, such

Characteristics of High-Quality Professional Development

From the Massachusetts Department of Education 1995-96 State Plan for Professional Development

Context:

- a shared vision for professional development within the district and the school that supports continuous improvement which is embedded in daily practice;
- coherent, high-quality professional development plans for districts and schools that are aligned with school, district, individual educator, and state goals;
- line item in district budgets that support professional development at a significant level;
- time and resources to plan, engage in, and assess professional development;
- supportive environments for educators to acquire, practice, and experiment with new learning;
- equitable access to opportunities for practicing, sharing, and disseminating successful practices on the job;
- collegiality and collaboration across and within professional roles;
- encouragement of and support for experimentation and risk taking.

Process:

- involvement of participants in professional development design, implementation, and evaluation;
- models that promote multiple strategies for professional growth that could include reflection, mentoring, guided practice, and study groups;
- follow-up that focuses on the application of professional development to the improvement of student learning;
- an ongoing evaluation process that uses multiple sources of information, including changes in classroom/leadership practices and student learning, and has a focus on all levels of the organization;
- understanding of effective approaches to professional development and their relationship to the culture of the school and district;
- opportunities to learn from peers across and within differing educational goals;
- technologies for classroom management, instruction, and professional growth.

Content:

- application of research, including principles of adult learning and the organizational change process;
- integration of the Common Core of Learning and the Curriculum Frameworks;
- discipline-specific and interdisciplinary approaches to teaching, learning, and assessment that incorporate high expectations for all students;
- developmentally appropriate strategies for instruction and curriculum that meet the needs of diverse student learners;
- strategies for reaching out to and involving families and communities;
- leadership skill training for school administration and management.

as the Massachusetts Statewide Systemic Initiative (MSSI) grant from the National Science Foundation, grants to educators from other departments for health education, drug awareness, and violence prevention. State funding is the largest single source of money for professional development in Massachusetts.

Federal Funds. The state receives Title I and Eisenhower money that is used for professional development activities. The MSSI provides funding for the training of math and science specialists. In Year 2 of Goals 2000, the state received \$6,990,859; \$4,103,611 was

for subgrants for in-service professional development activities; and \$1,900,000 was for pre-service professional development subgrants.

Local Funds. The Education Reform Act of 1993 called for districts to set aside funds for professional development equal to three percent of the amount spent on salaries. This set-aside was not mandated. However, districts are expected to calculate the three percent figure and compare it with their funding levels. The figure is a mechanism for calculating state reimbursement of professional development costs. Beginning in FY 1996, districts

must spend a minimum of \$25 per student for professional development, which will be reimbursed by the state. This amount increased to \$50 per student in FY 1997.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required by state regulation to create professional development plans. These plans should reflect the state's professional development goals, comprehensive district goals, and goals outlined in individual School Improvement Plans. (School Improve-

ment Plans are developed by school principals in consultation with each site's School Council.) The state also requires IPDPs as part of the new recertification regulations. The Education Reform Act mandates that district plans assist employees in the recertification process.

Districts can be state-registered providers of professional development points and offer a no-cost option for the recertification of teachers. The state plan for professional development calls for districts to have a budget line item for professional development, but they are not mandated to do so. The Education Reform Act recommended that districts dedicate a sum equivalent to three percent of all school salaries to professional development.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

All bargaining for professional development in Massachusetts occurs at the local level. Incentives and cost reimbursements for teacher professional development vary widely from district to district.

Teachers generally receive an incremental salary increase from their districts based on earned CEUs. The amount of the increment and approval process vary by district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The state teachers' organizations are registered providers that offer conferences and other professional development opportunities for their members. The Massachusetts Teachers' Association (MTA) provides on-site, ongoing technical assistance to local affiliates and, in many cases, to districts. The MTA has created new regional professional development programs and, in 1996-97, will enter a collaborative effort with the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents. Teacher organizations have been represented on various SEA-appointed advisory groups regarding professional development.

Higher education institutions provide professional development for educators. In western Massachusetts, the five-college consortium of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Smith College, Amherst College, Hampshire College, and Mount Holyoke College focuses on teacher professional development. UMASS Boston has a field center for teaching and is involved in several initiatives at the state level. Fitchburg State College has a rigorous professional development center. Several state colleges are also reported to be moving in this direction.

A wide variety of independent providers, private consultants, and subject-matter collaboratives offer professional development programs. In 1996, the SBE awarded 15 grants to providers offering innovative models of professional development.

Contacts/Information Resources

Susan Freedman
Executive Director
Certification and Professional Development Coordination
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148-5023
617-388-3300, ext. 211

Cheryl Ochs
Professional Development Specialist
Certification and Professional Development Coordination
Massachusetts Department of Education
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148-5023
617-388-3300, ext. 215

Nora Todd
Massachusetts Teachers Association
20 Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108
617-742-7950

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Michigan

Number of Teachers: 80,267

Average Years of Experience: 17

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 48%

Average Salary: \$45,218¹

Education Policy Context

Michigan serves approximately 1.5 million students in its 561 local school districts and 57 intermediate districts. The state has had a long history of local control over education policy. Since the 1970s, a "state mandate, state pay" law—the Headlee Amendment—has limited the state's ability to set regulations for local school districts. Nevertheless, the state has taken the lead in education reform, setting education policy that has had a significant impact on local schools.

Current reform efforts, such as adopting model curricula and standards for student outcomes, modifying the school accreditation system, and changing the state's student assessment system, have implications for teachers and their professional development. The 1990 Public Act (PA) 25 requires school districts to establish school improvement committees in each school building. Districts must disseminate an annual report for each building and the district as a whole that includes student outcome measures. PA 25 requires local and intermediate districts to incorporate professional development in their comprehensive school improvement plans. These plans must be updated every three to five years. In 1991, the state's first high-stakes student assessment program was implemented, requiring

students to pass assessments in math, reading, and science in order to receive a state-endorsed diploma. A new set of assessments is being developed for 1997.

PA 335, enacted in late 1993, completely restructured the way education is funded in the state, increasing the state share from 45 to 80 percent. The same law mandated that local education associations (LEAs) develop and adopt a core curriculum in math, science, social studies, and communication arts by 1997. PA 335 increased funding for professional development, at-risk students, and Math/Science Centers, and will extend the length of the school day from five to six hours by 1999-2000.

The State Role in Professional Development

Most decisions affecting teachers' professional development are made at the district level. However, the state has made efforts to establish a vision and direction for statewide professional development. The state Professional Standards Commission advises the Michigan State Board of Education (SBE) on teacher preparation and certification.

The Workgroup on Professional Development was established by the Governor's Office, the Michigan Department of Education (referred to hereafter

as the state education agency, or SEA) and the Michigan Partnership for Education (a private non-profit collaborative group including representatives from business, education, and state government) to create an action plan for professional development in the state. The Workgroup, supported by a 1994 grant from the National Governors' Association, designed a plan to create networks for professional development providers, to improve technology to help make professional development more accessible, to create demonstration sites, and to support an ongoing evaluation of the plan. The Workgroup established guiding principles for quality professional development that include developing school and district plans for staff development, ensuring equal access to high-quality providers, fostering collegiality among education personnel, allocating significant time for professional development, balancing school and individual needs and interests, and accessing relevant technology.

An Intra-agency Professional Development Coordination Committee developed, based on the Workgroup's guidelines, a definition of standards for professional development activities funded by the state. In late 1995, the SBE adopted these standards and the following definition:

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Professional development is a continuous process of improvement to promote high standards of academic achievement and responsible citizenship for all students. Professional development increases the capacity of all members of the learning community to pursue lifelong learning.

The state-adopted standards were designed to form "an infrastructure to assist local schools, academies and intermediate school districts to place professional development opportunities within the context of school improvement and to improve and provide access to such opportunities for all school communities." The standards also serve as the criteria the SBE uses to award funding for professional development activities.

Teacher Certification Policies. New teachers in Michigan receive a six-year provisional teaching certificate. They are required by the state to receive 15 days of professional development within the first three years of employment. New teachers are also assigned mentor teachers for the first three years. There is no special evaluation or assessment process for new teachers. There are no additional requirements to meet to obtain a professional teaching certificate.

The professional certificate must be renewed every five years by completing six semester hours of coursework or 18 continuing education units. The SBE is currently considering National Board Certification as a means of renewing certification, but only for one term.

State-Supported Programs. The School Development Unit in the SEA maintains a staff dedicated to oversight of school improvement plans and professional development. The Unit is also responsible for overseeing the school accreditation process, the annual education report, and school improvement planning. Unit staff participate in many state workshops. Other divisions in the SEA provide technical assistance to teachers and schools in specific areas, such as special education or vocational education.

The state funds a network of Math/Science Centers that provide professional development for teachers. Every district in the state is served by one of the 25 Centers or eight affiliated satellites. Each Center receives funding from the state and must set aside a portion of its funding for teacher professional development. The Centers are organized as a network, and their directors meet quarterly.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The state receives a Statewide Systemic Initiative (known as the Michigan SSI, or the MSSI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) to improve teacher professional development. The MSSI informs the consumers of professional development about quality standards and works with providers (such as the Math/Science centers) to help improve their services. The MSSI is coordinating other NSF grants in order to reduce duplication of effort.

Michigan uses Goals 2000 funds to support local districts' efforts to develop connections between schools and communities; set higher standards for students; improve technology; develop assessments to improve accountability; support professional development for teachers; and support structures that promote educational choices for families, including the establishment of charter schools.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. PA 335 eliminated categorical professional development programs and established a line-item in the state's budget for professional development. Of the funds distributed by formula, 65 percent is allocated to local districts at approximately \$4.25 per student for local activities, 15 percent goes to intermediate school districts for programs at the intermediate level, and 20 percent goes to the SEA for distribution on a competitive basis. Ten million dollars in state funds was set aside for professional development in 1994-95. However, in 1996-97, state aid for professional development was elimi-

nated. Math/Science Centers received \$6 million in state funding in 1994, but what portion of those funds was used for teacher professional development is not known.

Federal Funds. In FY 1995, Michigan received \$9,838,660 in Eisenhower grant money from the federal government. Michigan received \$14,371,488 in Goals 2000 funding in Year 2. This money was distributed to local districts for improvement efforts, including professional development for teachers. NSF funds in addition to the MSSI grant are also used for professional development in Michigan.

Local Funds. Education in Michigan is funded by the state. Most or all funding for professional development come from the state and federal governments.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Local districts and ISDs are required to prepare a school improvement plan that incorporates professional development. Districts must develop, and update annually, professional development plans in order to receive state funding for professional development. Local district plans are monitored by ISDs, which forward the plans to the SEA for approval.

School Code 1527 requires districts to set aside one day for professional development beginning in the 1997-98 school year. By the 2001-02 school year, districts must provide five days for professional development.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Collective bargaining affects professional development at the local level. Teachers typically receive salary increments based on professional development activities, such as college coursework. Teachers are generally reimbursed for tuition and other professional development costs. Decisions about reimbursement are made locally and vary by district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Michigan Education Association (MEA), the largest teacher organization in Michigan, provides professional development to its members. MEA offers training on a broad range of topics, including school improvement and other reform issues; hosts an 800-number for educators to access information on professional development opportunities around the state; and runs professional development schools, called Pioneer Schools. The MEA has been active in various statewide working groups and discussions related to professional development, such as setting state guidelines for professional development. The American Federation of Teachers is active in Michigan, and maintains a Quest Center in Detroit.

Subject-matter groups, such as the Michigan Reading Association and the Michigan Council of Teachers of Mathematics, have played significant roles in providing professional development and keeping their members up-to-date on current practices and objectives for student outcomes. These groups provide guidance on reform issues to the state, as well as to their membership. There is a curriculum council for each curriculum area; each council provides professional development for its constituents.

The Michigan Partnership for New Education has been a major supporter of teacher development in Michigan. A collaborative effort among leaders in business, education, and government, it was established in 1990 as a non-profit corporation supported by state and private funding. The partnership worked to provide different support structures for local schools such as the School and University Alliance, which focused on the creation and maintenance of school-university partnerships and included working with professional development schools; the Business and Community Alliance, which developed locally-based coalitions to support local innovation in schools; the Leadership Center, which attempted to develop a critical mass of leaders in education reform; and the

Education Extension Service, which provided practical researched-based knowledge to schools. The partnership has reportedly turned over virtually all its staff and has changed its mission to become a chartering agency. It still receives state support, but the role it now plays in professional development is unknown.

Contacts/Information Resources

Carol Logan
Director
Teacher Preparation and Certification
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-6505

Kathleen Mayhew
Coordinator
School Improvement and Professional Development
School Development Unit
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-6505

Maryanne Adams
Consultant for Professional Development and Human Rights
Michigan Education Association
P.O. Box 2537
East Lansing, MI 48826
517-335-6551

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Minnesota

Number of Teachers: 46,956**Average Years of Experience: 17****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 34%****Average Salary: \$36,148¹**

Education Policy Context

Minnesota's public schools currently serve 810,233 students. The state is implementing public education reform initiatives covering a wide range of issues, including student standards, restructuring state delivery systems for children's services, and restructuring teacher licensure. The state is implementing a series of public school choice options. Minnesota prides itself as a local control state, and most decisions regarding staff development take place at the district level.

The 1993 Omnibus Education Act directed the state Board of Education (SBE) and the agency now called the Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to develop results-oriented Graduation Standards. The proposed Graduation Standards have two components: the Profile of Learning and the Basic Skills Requirement. The Profile of Learning includes over 60 content standards that address ten elements of high academic achievement across the content areas. The Basic Skills Requirement consists of a series of competency tests in reading, math, and writing. In order to graduate, students must pass the competency tests and complete a series of assignments (known as a

performance package) that demonstrate a high level of achievement in the Profile of Learning content standards. The Graduation Standards were implemented beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the fall of 1996.

In October of 1995, Minnesota's Governor and legislature renamed and reorganized the SEA. The Minnesota Department of Children, Families, and Learning was created to unify state services for children and families under one agency. The newly restructured SEA is phasing in programs that serve children from the state's departments of human services, economic security, planning, corrections, and public safety. The reorganization is scheduled for completion by July of 1997.

The state is restructuring teacher licensing to be performance-based. Under the new system, beginning teachers have to pass a new performance assessment, consisting of three examinations, to obtain their initial licenses. They will be tested in basic skills, pedagogical knowledge, and licensure-specific skills. In addition, all beginning teachers must complete a one-year internship that includes mentoring, ongoing professional development, and performance assessment. New standards for teachers are under development; the new system is scheduled for statewide adoption by the year 2000.

The State Role in Professional Development

Many of the SEA's recent initiatives focus on standards for students, but they also incorporate professional development for educators. There is no comprehensive state plan that determines what professional development Minnesota's teachers receive. However, the state provides guidelines of what professional development activities are acceptable for relicensure purposes, and dedicates resources for disseminating best practices to educators. The need to prepare educators for reform is addressed through various state initiatives. The state's Goals 2000 Education Improvement Plan names teacher education and professional development as one of eight goals. Since 1984, the SEA has provided ongoing support to schools by allocating resources directly to districts for professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Minnesota State Board of Teaching, established in 1973, oversees the licensing of teachers and is active in setting standards for educators. The SEA Personnel Licensing Team evaluates and processes all applications for initial licensure and renewal of teacher and administrative licenses, in accordance with the rules set by the Board of Teaching and the SBE. This team

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

coordinates the review of college programs to ensure that they meet the requirements of the Board of Teaching and the SBE.

New teachers who graduate from an approved educator preparation program receive a two-year license. New teachers receive some support services, such as mentoring, but the services are not mandated by the state and vary from district to district. Most mentoring provided new teachers is administered by the state's teacher organizations, the Minnesota Federation of Teachers (MFT) and the Minnesota Education Association (MEA). The first three years of a teacher's career are considered probationary in terms of their district employment, but not in terms of state certification.

After successfully completing the first two years of teaching, educators must undergo 125 clock hours of professional development every five years to renew their licenses. The hours may consist of any professional growth activity accepted by district relicensing committees, the locally elected committees that develop recommendations (within specified state guidelines) for the renewal of individual teaching licenses. The Board of Teaching is considering National Board Certification for one license renewal period. The state does not have a master-level teaching license.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA Minnesota Educational Effectiveness Program (MEEP II) and the Office of District Organization are both involved in staff development for educators. Other SEA divisions, such as special education and vocational education, provide technical assistance to schools. The SciMathMN project, established by the legislature in 1993, is a partnership between education and business leaders advocating quality professional development for science and math teachers.

MEEP II provides a variety of school improvement support services, particularly in the area of staff development. In existence since 1984, MEEP II is currently helping schools prepare for Goals 2000 and the Graduation Rule. The state is divided into ten regions, each

with a MEEP II regional coordinator, a team of content area and assessment specialists, and one or more pilot sites for the Graduation Standards. The MEEP II regional coordinators present and facilitate informational sessions on the Graduation Standards; facilitate district planning; support district site teams in implementing their Graduation Standards plans; and provide informational sessions on study groups, team building, data-based decision making, and goal setting. They also design workshops with district or school personnel to address district- or site-specific concerns, and provide information on the Best Practice Networks in Reading, Math, Science, and Writing.

The Best Practice Networks (BPNs) are SEA-supported and selected teams of educators who receive additional training in their core content areas and the curriculum standards outlined in the new Graduation Rule. The four BPNs have teams in each MEEP II region. The BPNs ensure that school programs match state guidelines and national standards, help teachers try new techniques and find better teaching materials, build collaboration among teaching staff members, and align assessment with instruction. The teams are available to coach and mentor classroom teachers for a small fee, which covers the cost of substitute teachers, travel, and planning time.

MEEP II also provides training in graduation standards implementation for superintendents and principals; identification and training of a graduation standards implementation technician in each district; and regional information sessions for the MEA and the MFT. MEEP II coordinates summer regional training in support of the implementation of Graduation Standards.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Minnesota has an active Goals 2000 initiative. The state received money to create a comprehensive plan for school improvement. Fifteen percent of the money received was disbursed as subgrants to districts or consortia of districts for staff development. Three staff development grants were awarded to districts in 1995.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state's budget has no line item for professional development. However, the state has issued grants (ranging from \$18,000 to \$50,000) to districts for professional development. State funds for implementing Graduation Standards also support professional development. The amount of funding allocated to staff development activities is estimated to be \$20 million.

Federal Funds. In 1995, approximately \$103,000 was dispersed to three districts to implement professional development programs for teachers. Second-year Goals 2000 funding totaled \$5.3 million, of which 95 percent will be allocated to districts for implementation of the Graduation Standards. Approximately \$300,000 of this will be awarded to districts for professional development grants. Eisenhower funds and Chapter 1 funds also support professional development activities. In FY 1995, Minnesota received \$3,717,752 in Eisenhower funding.

Local Funds. In 1993, the state mandated that two percent of a district's general state aid budget should be set aside for professional development. However, this law was repealed, and beginning in the 1995-96 school year the two percent set-aside became optional. As a result, the bulk of funding for professional development is believed to come from local budgets.

The Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

In 1993, the Minnesota legislature established a process for staff development planning at the local level, which included district staff development committees. The committees, which consist of a teacher majority, align district staff development goals with the broad education outcome goals established by local boards of education. Individual schools, in turn, align their staff development plans with district goals.

The state established broad-based goals for staff development. District staff plans must fall within the scope of the state's broad goals for staff development.

Minnesota had required districts to allocate at least two percent of their general revenue dollars for staff development activities. This money was allocated as follows: 50 percent earmarked for districtwide staff development, 25 percent for sites, and 25 percent for grants to exemplary programs. This requirement was rescinded, beginning in 1995-96, to allow districts greater latitude in professional development.

Districts are required to file with the SEA a self-assessment report that outlines their staff development activities and expenditures, the perceived student outcomes relevant to the activities, and future goals based on the data. The purpose of the self-assessment report is to tie staff development to student-performance outcomes. The state does not mandate that a minimum number of days be set aside for professional development activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is bargained for at the local level. Most districts reimburse teachers, at least in part, for their expenses. Teachers receive increases on the salary scale for completing certain kinds of professional development activities. Many local union chapters negotiate for ongoing professional development for their members.

The MFT helped to pass legislation entitling teachers to a peer review process that assists them in the development of their pedagogical skills. Schools must have peer review committees for probationary and for continuing contract teachers. These committees evaluate probationary teachers three times each year during the first three years of employment in order to help improve instructional effectiveness. Similarly, the purpose of peer review for continuing teachers is to promote professional

growth. The committees do not determine whether a teacher should be suspended or terminated. Rather, they provide support, positive interaction, and opportunities for professional growth. The peer review process is not linked to licensure.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The MFT and the MEA are major sources of professional development opportunities for teachers. They play an active role in advocating quality professional development opportunities for their members. They host workshops and conferences and provide on-site technical assistance and support. The MFT and MEA also have their own mentoring programs for new teachers.

The state-administered BPNs, accessible on a regional basis, are a significant source of professional development for teachers. The Minnesota State Board of Teaching provides grants to districts to establish mentoring programs. Subject-matter teacher groups also provide professional development.

Higher education institutions are involved in professional development for teachers at the local level, notably the professional development schools at the University of Minnesota at Twin Cities and Patrick Henry High School in Minneapolis. Other partnerships exist between local schools and area higher education institutions. Higher education, however, does not seem to wield great influence over state teacher professional development policies.

The Minnesota Academic Excellence Foundation is a public-private partnership that sponsors mentoring programs and conducts training with districts.

Shared Decisions Minnesota is an organization that includes all of the state's major education associations, including the SEA, the MFT and MEA, the administrators' organizations, and others. They offer staff development and training in shared decision-making and provide training in conflict resolution and consensus building. This

project receives \$300,000 per year from the legislature.

Contacts/Information Resources

Mary Pfeifer
Manager
Division of Policy Development and Reporting
Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning
602 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-297-7204

Stephanie Parsons
State Coordinator for Staff Development
Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning
602 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-296-1429

Judy Wain
Minnesota State Board of Teaching
608 Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-296-2415

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Mississippi

Number of Teachers: 28,376

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 38%

Average Salary: \$25,153¹

Education Policy Context

Mississippi has created a standards-based public education system using performance assessments and high-stakes accountability measures at the local level. The current wave of reform emerged out of public discontent with the state's traditionally low rankings in the areas of student performance and instructional capacity. The Education Reform Act of 1982 (HB 4) is considered to be one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to be passed in Mississippi. It was designed to achieve the following outcomes: improved capacity for state-level educational leadership by reorganizing the Mississippi Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA); improved student achievement; increased competence of teachers and administrators; and increased accountability of educational systems at the state and local levels. HB 4 promoted teacher professional growth by requiring local districts to implement systemwide staff development programs, revise teacher certification and recertification regulations, and establish a performance-based teacher evaluation system.

The SEA is currently developing curriculum frameworks based on recently adopted content standards. A new state performance-based assessment is being used to measure student

proficiency in the standards. The assessment system was piloted in 1994-95 for grades 4-9 in English/language arts and mathematics. Mississippi's new high-stakes system uses student achievement data as a key measure of school and district functioning. Districts that demonstrate poor student performance are targeted to receive special technical assistance from the state and, in extreme cases, may be required to undergo "conservatorship" by the state.

The State Role in Professional Development

State Superintendent of Education Dr. Tom Burnham has identified staff development as the "key to change and accomplishing goals" and has indicated that the State Board of Education (SBE) places professional development within its top three goals for school reform. The Education Reform Act of 1982 mandates staff development programming at the state and local levels. Program guidelines issued by the SEA define staff development as "a mandatory program of activities which is initiated by the school district, based on identified instructional needs and designed to promote continued demonstration of the essential competencies and responsibilities necessary for the school district to meet its goals."

The SEA has issued staff development program guidelines; however,

local decision makers (representing districtwide input) are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating their own programs. The Commission on School Accreditation sets guidelines and oversees the approval process for district staff development plans. The 15-member commission has an SBE-appointed membership that consists of teachers, administrators, school board members, and community leaders.

In October of 1995, Dr. Burnham appointed a 24-member Professional Development Work Group and charged it with developing a Mississippi Professional Development Model. Members of the Work Group represent teachers, administrators, student support services, business and industry, institutions of higher education, and the SEA. Several "draft" models were proffered for public input from all educational communities across the state before the final document was approved by the SBE in May of 1996. The new model is scheduled for implementation beginning July 1, 1997.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Development (authorized under the Education Reform Act of 1982) is responsible for making recommendations to the SBE regarding standards for the preparation, certification, and professional development of public school teachers and administrators. The Commission also

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

monitors districts' training and evaluation programs for provisional teachers. Staffed by SEA personnel, the Commission is comprised of 15 members appointed by the SBE and represents teachers, administrators, institutions of higher education, local school board members, and community members.

The Education Reform Act of 1982 created a provisional license for new teachers, which is issued on a one-year basis for a maximum of three years. Provisional teachers are required to participate in a state-mandated, performance-based evaluation program. A team of trained evaluators uses the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI) to assess mastery in teaching. As a minimum, the provisionally licensed teacher must demonstrate mastery of at least 60 percent of the competencies during the first year (after trial two) to obtain a second provisional license. During their second provisional year (after trial four) 75 percent of the competencies must be mastered to obtain a provisional license. For teachers who require a third provisional year, (after trial six), 100 percent mastery is expected. A provisional teacher who has made six unsuccessful attempts to pass all competencies on the MTAI will not be eligible for certification in Mississippi. Consideration is currently underway to make MTAI requirements a part of teacher presence training.

Upon completing requirements at the provisional certification level, a teacher is eligible to receive a standard certificate. This certificate is renewable every five years, with the following prerequisites: that teachers accumulate 80 in-service credits (determined by the Commission on School Accreditation and awarded at the rate of one credit per hour) through district-sponsored staff development; and that either three semester hours of non-repeat credit within a content area, four continuing education units (CEUs) from a state-approved CEU program or activity, or 40 additional in-service credits have been obtained. Once the standard certificate is issued, recertification is not attached to a teacher evaluation process.

Teachers may augment their standard certificates in two ways, by

completing 18 semester hours in a content area and by completing a planned program in an area such as special education, computer applications, gifted education, or health education.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA provides guidance to districts in the planning and implementation of their staff development plans. Through various offices housed within the SEA (i.e., the Office of Instructional Development, Office of Teacher Certification, and Office of Leadership Development and Enhancement), the state also oversees teacher certification and evaluation and provides technical assistance to districts. The Office of Accreditation monitors districts' implementation of their staff development plans to ensure that they adhere to guideline specifications and address local improvement needs.

The SEA conducts statewide training activities related to state reform initiatives such as the Tech Prep program, performance-based assessment, and curriculum initiatives. During the summer of 1996, the SEA offered over 37,000 hours of professional development opportunities. In addition, the SEA trains school leadership teams in the "Onward to Excellence" school improvement process. Currently, over 200 schools in one-third of Mississippi's school districts have initiated this process for improving student performance.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute is a network of seven affiliate sites of the National Writing Project that uses school-university partnerships as a vehicle to improve K-12 instructional practice. Headquartered at Mississippi State University, the Writing/Thinking Institute has created writing projects at seven universities across the state. Since its inception in 1985, the Institute has provided 12 to 60 hours of training to more than 15,000 teachers in the creative uses of writing across the curriculum. Each summer, the Institute trains a cadre of between 86 and 100 lead teachers in writing instruction skills, preparing them to be Teacher Consultants for the Institute. During the year,

the Institute engages these consultants to provide staff development to districts. Typical district activities consist of five to ten three-hour sessions over the course of a year that give classroom teachers time to obtain feedback and discuss their experiences with others. During the 1994-95 school year, 3,716 teachers representing 141 districts participated in the Institute's staff development series. Funding for Institute activities is secured primarily through a state appropriation with supplemental support from federal and private sources. The Institute also collaborates with the SEA and was instrumental in the design and implementation of the statewide training effort for the new performance-based assessment system.

Goals 2000 funds are being used to support local school improvement initiatives in the areas of performance-based assessment, curriculum revision, professional development, and instructional technology. Goals 2000 subgrants have been awarded to at least one local district or district consortium in each of Mississippi's five congressional districts.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The passage of the Education Reform Act established categorical aid for district staff development activities, averaging \$10.50 per FTE. However, this appropriation was eliminated in 1990, and districts now receive no state funds that are earmarked specifically for professional development. Mississippi's legislature has, on occasion, appropriated funds to support statewide teacher training in the areas of curriculum standards, performance-based assessment, and instructional technology. In 1994-95, the SEA was allocated \$500,000 to implement a training program on the new assessment. For the 1995-96 year, the SEA received \$250,000 to provide teacher training on the new curriculum frameworks. An additional \$250,000 in state funds was appropriated to support training activities offered through the Mississippi Writing/Thinking Institute.

Federal Funds. Like many other states, Mississippi relies heavily on federal funding sources such as the Eisenhower Professional Development grant (\$3.6 million in FY 1995), Goals 2000 (\$1.3 million in FY 1995), and other federal programs to support professional development at the local level.

Local Funds. The SEA Coordinator for Professional Development reports that funding for staff development is largely a "local responsibility" and often falls short due to the competing demands placed on strained local budgets.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required to implement a staff development plan that offers a minimum of 26 hours of in-service credit. State guidelines recommend that district plans be developed by a committee consisting primarily of teachers and including administrators, school board members, and community members. The content of the staff development plan is based on data collected through a local needs assessment.

Each district must designate a staff development coordinator who receives training from the SEA and who attends ongoing meetings throughout the year on how to use student performance data to guide decisions regarding staff development needs. Districts that do not submit an annual plan or develop plans that do not meet approval are considered to be at risk of losing their accreditation.

Mississippi's current school-year calendar provides seven days that districts may assign for in-service, record-keeping, or other activities. This provision is included in teacher contracts.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries are determined by a state schedule that awards increments for years of experience and advanced degrees or graduate credits earned. Recently, legislation was passed to

award National Board Certified teachers an annual pay increase of \$3,000 for the ten-year life of the certificate. Board-certified teachers are also reimbursed for the \$2,000 cost of undergoing the assessment. Currently, there are three Board-certified teachers in Mississippi.

Teacher compensation for participation in professional development activities may be offered at the discretion of individual districts. Most educators reported, however, that tuition reimbursement, stipends, and salary enhancements are not common.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Mississippi Staff Development Council (MSDC), formed in 1986, is a state network of staff developers that seeks to promote professional staff development standards. Currently, over 200 educators throughout the state participate in MSDC activities, which include: an annual three-day conference featuring both national and state leaders in the field of staff development; a quarterly newsletter; and access to materials and resources generated by the National Staff Development Council. MSDC activities are governed by a Board of Directors that consists of elected officers and seven members-at-large, as elected by the general membership.

The Mississippi Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM) is comprised of more than 1,100 mathematics educators who meet and exchange ideas to improve the mathematics instruction offered by elementary, secondary, and postsecondary institutions. Each year, MCTM sponsors a statewide conference with over 100 workshop sessions. The group also publishes two newsletters, "Math Minutes" and "The Math New Network." Teacher recognition is a major focus of MCTM activities, as evident in its Teacher of the Year awards and the Mathematics Education Trust Fund, which provides teachers with \$250 mini-grants to support creativity and innovation in mathematics instruction. MCTM continually develops and con-

ducts teacher training programs that directly respond to state reforms in curriculum and assessment. Funding for MCTM training programs is provided by the SEA through federal Eisenhower funds.

Regional consortia have been formed to allow geographically remote and small districts to pool their resources and share ideas in order to obtain quality technical assistance and professional development services. Nine consortia currently exist in Mississippi and, while the governance structure varies by partnership, most are affiliated with one or more institutions of higher education (IHEs).

Generally speaking, IHEs in Mississippi offer coursework as their primary delivery model for teacher professional development. However, an initiative funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation during the mid-1980s attempted to expand this role by bringing together IHEs, district leaders, teachers, and the SEA to conduct a joint review and planning process regarding staff development needs and issues. Key recommendations produced by the project were: IHE services should be designed to meet the local needs of district teachers; IHE faculty should provide staff development services at the school-site; staff development activities should be evaluated; and a statewide staff development board should be created to provide ongoing credibility and financial support for shared decision making in policies and programs affecting continuing teacher development. Although it is difficult to document the legacy of the Mellon project, the participation of IHEs in the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification, and Development and district consortia staff development planning indicates that they are valued partners in the provision of professional development.

Contacts/Information Resources

Johnny A. Franklin
Director
Office of Instructional Development
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771, Suite 804
Jackson, MS 39205
601-359-3778

Joan P. Haynie
Coordinator of Staff Development
Office of Instructional Development
Mississippi Department of Education
P.O. Box 771, Suite 804
Jackson, MS 39205
601-359-3778

Sherry Swain
Director
Mississippi Writing and Thinking
Institute
P.O. Box 6077
Mississippi State, MS 39702
601-325-7777

Publications and Reports

Guidelines for Staff Development Programs. Mississippi Department of Education (May 1992).

Designing the Staff Development System of the Future. Mississippi Public Education Forum (September 1993).

Professional Development Task Force: Findings and Recommendations. Mississippi Public Education Forum (1995).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Missouri

Number of Teachers: 54,543

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 42%

Average Salary: \$30,324¹

Education Policy Context

Missouri's public school system consists of 525 school districts and serves a student population of 866,544. Since the mid-1980s, the state's education reform policies have focused on ensuring that all school districts have equitable access to professional development resources and opportunities.

The Excellence in Education Act of 1985 mandated the establishment of district-level professional development committees (PDCs) to oversee local in-service activities. This law also required districts to provide a two-year mentoring support program for beginning teachers. The Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 (SB 380) mandated that the State Board of Education (SBE) develop "academic performance standards" identifying the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary for students to advance successfully through the public school system. SB 380 also required the SBE to provide curriculum frameworks to assist districts in redesigning local curricula to meet the performance standards. Teacher-based committees developed the curriculum frameworks, which were officially adopted in December of 1995. During the 1996-97 school year, the Missouri Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) will begin phasing in components of the state's new performance-based assessment system, which

will be used to track student outcomes in relation to the standards. By the 1997-98 school year, districts will implement locally designed curricula based on the frameworks, and by the fall of 1998 the new assessment will be one of the criteria used in the School Improvement Program.

SB 380 created a new foundation formula expected to raise \$390 million for public education. The new funding formula provides resources to promote technology in the schools, develop special programs for at-risk populations, fund full-day kindergarten, expand summer instructional programs, and set aside a specific amount for professional development. Beginning in the 1994-95 school year, each school district had to commit 1 percent of its state aid money (exclusive of categorical add-ons) for professional development. In addition, 1 percent of its state aid funds was earmarked for the SEA to "disseminate information about successful professional teaching practices and programs."

The State Role in Professional Development

Missouri does not have a formal state plan for professional development, although SEA staff are currently using a concept paper entitled "Teacher Preparation: Recruitment to Retirement" to help shape a strategic plan for teacher certification and professional growth. This plan was presented to the legisla-

ture during the spring of 1996 session. It proposes revisions in preservice education, teacher certification, and professional development requirements based on standards established by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

A key provision of SB 380 was the establishment of nine Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). During the 1993-94 school year, the SEA conducted a national review of the literature and sponsored a series of educator forums to solicit ideas on professional development. The resulting principles, which serve as guidelines for the RPDCs, are:

1. educators must acknowledge the link between professional growth and changed behavior;
2. there must be communication and collaboration between professional development providers and consumers;
3. professional development must be linked to school improvement; and
4. professional development designs must be based on research from the field.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

The SEA convenes bi-monthly meetings of all RPDC directors to discuss implementation issues and respond to programming needs. In addition, Missouri is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. Passed in 1985, House Bill 1457 created the Missouri Advisory Council on Certification to review policies and issue recommendations for teacher certification. The Advisory Council helped to revise teacher licensing policies that bestowed life-time certificates. The new policy consists of a three-tier licensing structure, based on years of teaching experience, and was officially adopted by the SBE in 1988.

The Professional Certificate I (PCI) is a non-renewable, three-year certificate issued to beginning teachers. The Excellence in Education Act requires each district to provide a locally designed two-year mentoring and professional development program for PCI teachers. Beginning teachers must accumulate 30 clock hours of in-service training over a three-year period, successfully complete a performance-based evaluation,⁷ and are expected to be required to pass a performance test in the future. If PCI requirements are not satisfied at the end of the first three-year period, an extension may be granted under special circumstances.

The Professional Certificate II (PCII) is a seven-year certificate renewable upon completion of 30 clock hours of in-service training and 12 semester hours of college course credit. Teachers who have a master's degree are exempt from the additional college credit requirement. PCII teachers must also continue to follow and update their individual professional development plans.

The Continuous Professional Certificate (CPC) is a ten-year certificate that is awarded to teachers with a minimum of ten years of in-state teaching experience and a master's degree in education or their content area of certification. Teachers with ten years of experience who have acquired National Board Certifica-

tion also qualify for this certificate. Once obtained, there are no additional renewal requirements at the CPC level.

Teacher licensing applications are administered by the SEA's Division on Urban and Teacher Education. This office is working with the Advisory Council on Certification, the University of Missouri, and other state-level experts in core content areas to develop K-12 teaching competencies that are based on Missouri's performance standards and INTASC principles. The teaching competencies are expected to be established by the fall of 1997, and training in the competencies will become a required component for teacher education program accreditation. The SEA also plans to implement a Teacher Academy Program in 1997 that will help teachers prepare for National Board Certification.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA houses an Office of Professional Development that oversees the professional development activities of four statewide school improvement initiatives: Select Teachers as Regional Resources (STARR), the Missouri Assessment Project (MAP 2000), the Accelerated Schools Program, and the Re:Learning Project. The Office of Professional Development has set aside 5 percent of its operating budget for program evaluation. The SEA contracted with the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) to conduct a comprehensive evaluation, and a report was expected in July of 1996.

Created by SB 380, the STARR program identifies and develops cadres of teachers to serve as district-level trainers and consultants. STARR teachers participate in a two-year training and leadership program that covers instructional techniques based on Missouri's academic performance standards. Since 1994, 23 teachers have been selected each spring to participate in the STARR program, which begins with a three-day summer workshop on authentic instruction. During the school year, STARR teachers practice workshop techniques in their classrooms and attend regional and state-level meetings with other participants. During their second year, STARR teachers are given a paid leave of absence to work with RPDC staff to provide in-service training

to districts around the state (the state provides funds to pay for replacement teachers). Each spring, a new cadre of 23 teachers with at least three years of experience is selected. The selection committee, which also determines the focus of each cadre's training, consists of SEA staff, higher education institutions, teacher organizations, and K-12 administrators and teachers.

SB 380 also created MAP 2000 to train Missouri's public school educators in the skills necessary to implement the state's new performance-based assessment (expected to be implemented in 1996-97). MAP 2000 teachers participate in a three-year training program that develops their skills in performance assessment development, use, and scoring. Teachers are nominated by home districts or by a professional educator organization. The district is required to supply a minimal financial commitment and teacher release time. During 1995-96, participation in MAP 2000 was optional; however, SEA officials estimate that 40 percent (200) of Missouri's districts were involved.

In 1988, Missouri became involved in the Accelerated Schools Project. Over 125 Missouri schools are members of the Accelerated Schools network. These schools have made a commitment to a process of change that values shared decision making and promotes high expectations for all students. The SEA provides ongoing training to network participants through three regional Accelerated Schools centers. Teams from first-year network members are required to attend a week-long summer academy and monthly meetings throughout the school year. Continuing member teams attend cross-site meetings three times each year. Every Accelerated School receives on-site assistance and mentor visits throughout the year and participates in a two-day retreat held in June.

Additional SEA programs include: MAST, an electronic answer line that provides information on education trends, curriculum development, and Missouri's new standards; Project Construct, which provides training for pre-K through grade 2 teachers in Project Construct curriculum, instruction, and assessment; Success Leads to Success, which identifies exemplary school im-

provement programs and provides funds for staff to observe site activities, receive resource materials, and attend conferences; the Missouri Assessment Project, which provides professional development in the use of standards and performance assessments offered through the New Standards Project; the Network Project, which provides technology training; and the Transitional Middle School Certification Program, which offers tuition reimbursement for teachers and administrators in grades 5-9 who satisfactorily complete coursework necessary for middle school certification.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Re:Learning Project has been a component of Missouri's school improvement efforts since 1993. Currently, 100 schools representing over 3,000 teachers participate in Re:Learning professional development activities. Schools that commit to Re:Learning are eligible to receive an incentive grant of up to \$10,000 for each of their first three years in the project. All Re:Learning school personnel participate in week-long summer institutes held at various project sites throughout the state. Schools with less than four years in the project receive Level I summer institute training that reinforces Re:Learning philosophies. More experienced Re:Learning schools receive Level II summer institute training that focuses on advanced concepts.

Missouri is using Goals 2000 funds to award subgrants in five focal areas, one of which is professional development. The subgrant process encourages collaboration among districts, colleges, businesses, and RPDCs in designing and implementing professional development strategies that simultaneously support the district's school improvement efforts and its redesign of the teacher education program. Grantees receive continuing funding for up to four years, provided they substantiate the progress and impact of their comprehensive plans.

The National Science Foundation has awarded an Urban Systemic Initiatives (USI) grant to the St. Louis Public Schools. These funds are being used to support professional development in mathematics and science.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. As mentioned earlier, 2 percent of all state-aid funds for public education is earmarked for professional development. According to one SEA official, this allocation totals \$20 million each year (\$10 million for state-sponsored programs, and \$10 million for district-sponsored activities). RPDCs are funded at the level of \$1.5 million dollars (\$150,000 for each of the nine centers). State funds for the RPDCs are reduced or eliminated after the first three years of program operation, once the centers become self-sustaining. The annual operating budget for the STARR program is \$1 million. The state allocates approximately \$900,000 per year to support the Accelerated Schools Project. The 1995-96 Re:Learning Project has a state budget of \$578,000. The Career Ladder Program (described below), which receives a separate appropriation from the legislature, has an average annual budget of \$26 million per year.

Federal Funds. During 1995-96, Missouri received a \$3.5-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant and a \$6.5-million Goals 2000 grant (a portion of which was used to support professional development activities). Other federal programs, such as Title I, Title II, and Perkins, also provide funds for teacher training activities.

Local Funds. A local set-aside of 1 percent of state-aid funds must be allocated for professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The Excellence in Education Act requires each district to establish a PDC to oversee the planning and implementation of local in-service and beginning teacher mentoring activities. By law, the PDCs are governed by classroom teachers and are responsible for determining staff development activities as identified in a district's annual strategic plan. Although the PDCs have functioned in this capacity since 1988, it was not until SB 380 that a percentage of districts'

state-aid funds (1 percent) was mandated to be allocated specifically for the implementation of professional development plans. The PDCs manage the budget for the 1 percent allocation and identify the contractors and services for local in-service activities.

There are no mandated in-service or non-instructional days built into the official school year calendar. However, state guidelines require districts to "provide time" for staff development programs.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

There is no collective bargaining in the state of Missouri. All districts have a salary schedule that considers graduate credits and years of experience in determining salary increments. SB 380 mandates that, effective in the 1996-97 school year, teachers with a master's degree and ten years of teaching experience will receive a minimum salary of \$24,000—a \$6,000 increase above the salaries of teachers without a master's degree. At the same time, however, SB 380 rescinded the state's tuition reimbursement program for teachers.

Missouri offers a Career Ladder Program, created by the Excellence in Education Act. Teachers who choose to participate in the program may earn annual salary supplements of \$1,500, \$3,000, or \$5,000, based on years of teaching experience and classroom performance. Although the bulk of funds for this program is acquired through a state appropriation, participating districts must commit a portion of local funds. The Career Ladder Program requires participating teachers to assume added responsibilities in the areas of professional growth, school/community involvement, or faculty collaboration. A 1994 review of the program estimated that 229 districts and 10,500 teachers were involved in this activity.

STARR teachers receive a \$100-per-day stipend plus expenses for their participation in the summer training workshop. Expenses incurred from attending STARR meetings, ordering materials, and conducting training sessions are also reimbursed by the SEA.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Missouri National Education Association (MNEA) is a major professional development provider and is one of three teacher organizations in the state that offers services in this area. Through its Instruction and Professional Development Division, the MNEA conducts teacher training activities at the state, regional, and local levels. The MNEA hosts an annual, one-day conference in the spring on instructional strategies. The MNEA also specializes in conducting workshops for districts' PDCs that, among other things, provide committee members with an overview of the law governing the use of PDC funds.

Institutions of higher education have taken a leadership role in the design and delivery of professional development for practicing educators. In July of 1994, the SEA selected nine Missouri colleges and universities to serve as RPDC sites, which offer a cost-efficient and systemic approach to ensuring that all districts have equal access to information and resources that reflect best teaching practices. While the state has provided start-up funds to support RPDC activities, the primary funding base will be secured through service fees charged to local districts. By mandate, RPDCs are university-based to strengthen linkages between higher education institutions and districts. RPDC policies and activities are determined locally by an executive board, comprised primarily of teachers, and administered by a center director.

Cooperating Schools Districts (CSD) is a consortium of 46 member districts located in the greater St. Louis metropolitan area. Founded in 1928, CSD's mission is to enhance educational opportunities for all children by providing technical assistance, resource materials, and training to educators. Nearly 40 percent of all Missouri public school teachers participate in CSD activities. Districts pay dues (based on wealth and student population) to participate in the consortium and may opt for a full or associate membership.

The Learning Exchange in Kansas City, Missouri, is a non-profit educational center for research, development,

and innovation. Since 1972, The Learning Exchange has provided school-site coaching and training, as well as leadership and curriculum development, to support and equip educators in implementing effective, innovative instructional practice. It addresses the staff development needs of educators in more than 300 school districts in Kansas and Missouri and over 1,000 districts nationally. The Learning Exchange is also the home of Exchange City and EarthWorks, both large-scale learning labs with integrated curricula and simulations in economics, mathematics, and science that are visited by more than 35,000 students, teachers, and parents annually. Funding for The Learning Exchange is provided by businesses and foundations, as well as client fees from service membership packages, program enrollments, and individual training activities.

The Missouri State Teachers Association (MSTA) is an organization of educators to advance the ideals and standards of the teaching profession and to secure conditions necessary for the greatest efficiency of public schools in Missouri. Organizationally, MSTA is composed of over 500 local Community Teachers Associations (CTAs), 12 district associations, 37 departments, an Assembly of Delegates and 11 statewide committees including the Executive Board. Services provided to its membership include lobbying and legislative report, legal and financial assistance for educators, field service and salary schedule consultation, publications, research, insurance, professional organizations, departments, leadership conferences, workshops and clinics, public relations, assistance with CTA programs, recreation, curriculum aids, credit unions, in-service training, improvement of instruction conferences and current issues in education conferences. For more information, contact:

Dr. John A. Jones
Research Coordinator
407 S. Sixth St., P.O. Box 458
Columbia, MO 65205
Phone: 573-442-3127
e-mail: john_jones@mail.msta.org

Contacts/Information Resources

Celeste Ferguson
Assistant Commissioner
Division on Urban and Teacher Education
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
205 Jefferson Street, 6th Floor
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314-751-2931

Douglas Miller
Coordinator of Professional Development
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
205 Jefferson Street, 6th Floor
Jefferson City, MO 65102
314-751-2200

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Montana

Number of Teachers: 9,950
Average Years of Experience: 14
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 26%
Average Salary: \$28,200¹

Education Policy Context

Montana is a very large state with a small, geographically dispersed K-12 population of about 164,000 enrolled in its 465 districts. An elected superintendent of public instruction and a Board of Public Education, appointed by the governor, share responsibilities for school-system policy making, supervision, and management. Each district is governed by an elected local board of trustees.

In 1987, the state legislature established Project Excellence, which brought together educators, elected officials, and other constituent groups to design a vision for quality education in Montana. Project Excellence resulted in the development of new school accreditation standards, which were adopted in 1989. The accreditation standards include program area standards in communication arts, fine arts, health enhancement, mathematics, science, social studies, vocational/practical arts, library media, and guidance. Districts are required to develop curricula that incorporate these program standards, addressing at least one of the nine program area standards each year. By the year 2000, district curricula must reflect all nine areas and be aligned with a local assessment process to ensure the effectiveness of the process.

Beginning in the 1996-97 school year, schools may choose to participate

in a performance-based accreditation process for which they develop a school/community profile, an education mission statement, learner outcomes, and a five-year school improvement plan. The Office of Public Instruction (OPI) is developing a performance-based accreditation manual, which will recommend professional development as a component of the school improvement plan.

There is neither a state core curriculum nor any state assessment. However, districts are required to annually report test results for students in grades 4, 8, and 11. The Montana Educational Telecommunications Network (METNET) provides telecommunications services among educators in K-12 education, the university system, and state offices. Toll-free numbers allow schools to access this network.

The State Role in Professional Development

Montana does not have a state professional development plan or standards, nor has the State Board of Education (SBE) adopted an overarching policy statement in this regard. State mandates for teacher professional growth are, for the most part, imbedded in the recertification process described below.

In addition, Montana is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will

undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Montana Certification and Practices Advisory Council (CSPAC) was established by the legislature in 1987. It accepts charges from the SBE and other groups to study and make recommendations in the areas of certification standards and policies, teacher education programs, and standards for professional practice. The SBE-appointed, seven-member council consists of three teachers, one K-12 specialist, one faculty member from an approved teacher education program, one school administrator, and one local school board member. CSPAC is staffed by a full-time SBE administrator, and its activities are funded by the revenue raised from certification fees.

CSPAC initiated the Montana Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP) in 1992, as a three-year research project to study whether and how one-on-one mentoring relationships between veteran and first-year teachers facilitated the pace and quality of a new teacher's development into a competent teacher. Thirty-five mentor/first-year teacher pairs representing schools throughout the state participated in the study. A comparative analysis (using a non-mentored controlled group) was employed. The final report concluded that

mentoring support received during the first year significantly enhanced teacher retention rates and competency (as gauged through teacher evaluations conducted by principals). To promote the implementation of mentoring programs statewide, CSPAC is developing a beginning-teacher support resource manual that interested local schools may use in designing their programs.

Beginning teachers are issued a Class 2 Standard Certificate, which is renewable every five years upon acquiring 60 renewal units (two-thirds of which must be earned through college credit) and one year of teaching experience. Renewal units may be earned through college coursework or approved in-service activities. Renewal units are awarded at the rate of one per clock hour.

The Class 1 Professional Certificate, valid for five years, is issued to teachers who either earn a master's degree, complete 30 graduate credit hours, or undergo a fifth-year internship and who have three years of successful teaching experience. Prior to 1995, one year of teaching experience was the only renewal requirement for the professional certificate. Now, Class 1-certified teachers must earn 60 renewal units in addition to teaching experience in order to renew the professional certificate.

In 1995, OPI issued a list of approved renewal unit providers, which include regionally accredited colleges and universities, state-accredited school systems, professional education organizations, and governmental agencies. Providers may award renewal units for the professional development activities they conduct. School systems have the additional authority to award renewal units for in-service activities conducted by providers that are not on the SBE-approved list (e.g., out-of-state conferences). To be approved, providers must submit an application and undergo a compliance process that consists of providing OPI with an annual report of their professional development programs, participating in OPI audits, and keeping records of descriptions, dates, locations, and numbers of participants for renewal unit activities.

CSPAC is reviewing the work of the National Board for Professional Teach-

ing Standards to study the role that National Board Certification might play in acknowledging exemplary classroom teachers in Montana. There are currently no National Board certified teachers in Montana. However, the SBE has ruled that any out-of-state, National Board Certified teacher (already certified in another state) should receive automatic state certification when they begin teaching in Montana.

State-Supported Programs. The OPI has reduced its staff within the past two years due to fiscal cutbacks. The OPI reorganization eliminated nine curriculum specialist positions; there are currently five state specialists who are available to provide districts with technical assistance and/or in-service training in the general areas of instructional technology, curriculum and assessment, school improvement, and professional development. Ten curriculum consortia support and facilitate statewide meetings and workshops on accreditation standards and model learning goals. These activities are conducted to help districts comply with curriculum and assessment development requirements. Consortia members represent OPI, professional educator organizations, and institutions of higher education.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Systemic Initiative for Montana Mathematics and Science (SIMMS) was established in 1991 with a five-year, \$10-million Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation. SIMMS sought to reform mathematics instruction at the secondary level by developing an innovative, multi-disciplined, technology-integrated curriculum and by training teachers to understand and implement the new curriculum. Teachers received training on the use of new assessment techniques. Over 500 high school math teachers have attended SIMMS summer institutes and extended study courses. SIMMS also initiated professional development in science. The Montana Council of Teachers of Mathematics (MCTM) managed SIMMS and, in collaboration with the Montana Science Teacher Association (MSTA), formed the Montana Mathematics and Science Society (MMASS). MMASS is

dedicated to continuing curriculum and instructional reform. Although SSI funding expired in 1996, SIMMS goals are being used as guidelines by OPI and the Office of Higher Education for awarding Eisenhower grants.

The OPI was required by the legislature to return federal Goals 2000 funds and discontinue any Goals 2000 activities.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not appropriate any funds specifically for professional development. However, the formula for general school aid includes funding for a maximum of seven "pupil instruction-related" (PIR) days that districts may use for in-service activities. Districts must use at least three of these days for instructional and professional development or other in-service training.

Federal Funds. Montana received a \$1.2 million Eisenhower grant in 1995-96. Schools apply annually to receive Eisenhower professional development grants. SSI and state funds were allocated at approximately \$122 per student (\$6 million total) per year to support SIMMS training activities, and \$3 million was allocated to schools implementing the SIMMS curriculum for technology purchases.

Local Funds. Professional development activities conducted by districts are supported through their general fund budgets, which include local revenues.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are required to develop a "plan of action" describing the intended use of the three or more state-funded PIR days devoted to professional development. School accreditation standards stipulate that the use of PIR days be determined through shared decision making by teachers and administrators.

Districts are required to allocate two PIR days for professional development to coincide with the statewide annual

professional development meetings of teachers' organizations. During these days, districts may conduct their own in-service activity or allow teachers to attend the statewide teacher meeting; however, the two days must be spent in professional development activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Compensation agreements are negotiated at the local level. Most districts provide advancement on the salary schedule based on years of teaching experience and highest degree earned. In addition, some offer movement for additional college credits and renewal units. Tuition reimbursement is generally not offered. There have been cases in larger districts in which teachers have received paid sabbaticals.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Each October, the Montana Education Association (MEA) and the Montana Federation of Teachers (MFT) co-sponsor a two-day Educators' Conference. The conference also involves teacher subject-matter associations throughout the state. This event attracts 3,500 participants and features more than 500 workshops and presentations covering a variety of subject-matter and pedagogical issues. Teachers may earn up to 15 renewal units if they fully participate in the conference. Districts are required to close schools on the two days that the conference is scheduled, so that teachers will be able to attend at full pay. The conference registration fee may be paid by teachers or their districts.

Montana State University (MSU) has maintained a partnership with the Bozeman Public School District (BPSD) since 1991. The mission of the BPSD-MSU Partnership is to engage members of this joint educational community in "collaborative work to improve education for students and increase professional development opportunities and empowerment." Partnership activities are extensive, structured around eight

components: (1) a mentor program, for which MSU graduates work as interns in BPSD schools and are assigned mentors during their first year; (2) joint appointments for teachers at MSU and Bozeman High School; (3) field placements, in which MSU and district staff meet to discuss internship issues and experiences; (4) research and scholarship producing joint publications by MSU and BPSD staff; (5) a magnet school with which MSU assists BPSD; (6) an early childhood education committee of MSU and BPSD staff who work with child care providers on issues in early childhood education; (7) individual partnerships that represent one-on-one collaborations between MSU and BPSD staff; and (8) in-service activities jointly sponsored by MSU and BPSD. In 1992, partnership activities were extended to include three other districts and the county superintendent.

Several Montana universities and colleges have been involved in SIMMS. These partners include Montana State University, the University of Montana, and the Tribal Community Colleges.

In 1985, Montana's Wildlife Parks Service joined the national Project WILD organization. Montana's Project WILD was originally staffed by the OPI science specialist and 20 teachers who received training and were certified as Project WILD facilitators. Project WILD is a state-approved in-service provider and offers training workshops upon request to any district or school. The one-day workshop includes the WILD curriculum guide and hands-on techniques in its application. Teachers may also register for week-long workshops offered during the summer. Over 500 teachers participate in Project WILD workshops each year.

Contacts/Information Resources

Peter Donovan
Executive Officer
Certification Standards and Practices
Advisory Council
2500 Broadway
Helena, MT 59620-0601
406-444-6576

June Atkins
Professional Development Coordinator
Montana Office of Public Instruction
Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501
406-444-3095

Eric Feaver
President
Montana Education Association
1232 East Sixth
Helena, MT 59601
406-442-4250

Publications and Reports

The Montana Beginning Teacher Support Program: Final Report prepared by Dr. Lee Spuhler and Dr. Alan Zetler for the Certification and Standards Practices and Advisory Council, Montana State Board of Public Education (July 1995).

Implications of National Board Certification on the Development of Montana Educators; Montana Steering Committee on National Board Certification - CSPAC (July 1995).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Nebraska

Number of Teachers: 19,552
 Average Years of Experience: 16
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 36%
 Average Salary: \$29,564¹

Education Policy Context

Nebraska's K-12 public education system is organized into 700 school districts and 19 regional service agencies. With a relatively small population dispersed over a large geographic area, there has been a long history of local control over education policy. For example, curriculum and graduation requirements are set locally, and there are no statewide textbook adoption or assessment programs. The Nebraska Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) provides leadership to Nebraska's schools in promoting quality learning, equity, and accountability through the High Performance Learning Model. Current issues of concern relate to setting priorities as schools face potential financial constraints.

In September of 1995, a panel jointly appointed by the commissioner of education and the governor initiated the development of general educational goals and academic content standards for Nebraska students. During 1995-96, a series of panel meetings, work committees, and a statewide video conference were held to assist in developing the goals and standards. A draft has been adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) for further discussion and refinement before the goals and standards are used in Nebraska schools. The SBE also has passed a resolution requiring that

the accreditation of schools incorporate how well students are learning as defined by the Nebraska Standards. Both school improvement and professional development are tied to the accreditation process.

The State Role in Professional Development

Nebraska's education reform vision values professional development as being the cornerstone of school success. This vision was conceived by Commissioner of Education Christensen when he served as deputy commissioner, and it is synthesized in the 1992 document, *High Performance Learning: A Model for Redesigning Education for All Nebraska Students*. In this document, Dr. Christensen describes strategies for and assumptions about school improvement that emphasize the need for investments in training and professional development; he also calls for a commitment to providing the time needed "for individuals to wrestle with and work through their attitudes, beliefs and values (and to change them) so that behavior ultimately changes."

Teacher Certification Policies. Rule 21 (92 NAC 21) regulates the teacher certification process. Enacted in August of 1995, this rule includes provisions for teaching certificates, administrative certificates, temporary teaching and administrative certificates,

special services counseling certificates, reciprocity, and the appeals procedure. Local districts may perform criminal background checks at their discretion. Fingerprinting is required by statute for out-of-state individuals applying for their first Nebraska certificate.

The first regular certificate granted to a teacher is the Initial Teaching Certificate, which is valid for five years. Applicants must have completed an approved teacher preparation program and satisfied the basic skills competency requirement by receiving a passing score on a competency test, satisfying a special education competency, and completing an approved human relations training competency.

The Standard Certificate is issued upon completion of two successive years of teaching experience and is renewable every seven years with six semester hours or two consecutive years of teaching experience. The Professional Teaching Certificate requires the completion of a graduate degree, which must be in the same area as the teacher's undergraduate degree. The Professional Certificate is renewable every ten years with six semester hours or one year of teaching experience, except for those issued prior to July 11, 1977, which are valid for the life of the holder.

Teachers may apply for tenure, or "permanent certification," at the beginning of their fourth year of teaching. Permanently certified staff must earn six semester hours of college credit for

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

every six years of employment or demonstrate evidence of professional growth, as determined by the local board. Evidence of professional growth may include educational travel, professional publications, or work on education committees. The local board has complete discretion over what constitutes professional growth and may decide to accept only college credits to satisfy this requirement.

State-Supported Programs. Professional development is provided to districts through direct training, organization of networks and support groups, assistance in developing and implementing school improvement plans, and technical assistance as provided through Nebraska's 19 Educational Service Units (ESUs). The ESUs were created by the legislature, serve specific geographic areas, and have the power to levy property taxes. Most are staffed by a professional development director, a technology specialist, and other consultants who facilitate school improvement planning and provide training. The SEA assists ESU staff in facilitating local school improvement planning, identifying building-level training needs (based on student achievement data), developing target goals, implementing strategies and training activities, and focusing discussions at the school level pertaining to instruction. In addition, they broker and network information and resources to enable schools and districts to receive the professional development assistance they require.

Nebraska's Education Innovation Fund was established in 1993 through proceeds generated by the state's lottery system. The Fund supports two types of grant programs that promote innovative educational projects. Mini-grants provide resources to public school districts for the sole purpose of developing and revising their districtwide strategic school improvement plan (SSIP). Major competitive grants are intended to encourage schools to develop innovations in programs or practices that result in the restructuring of school organization, management, and instructional programs. Grant proposals must be linked to needs identified in the SSIP. In addition,

proposals must address one or more of the funding priorities that are set by statute, and staff development is one of these priorities. SEA officials report that the Education Innovation Fund has enabled an increase in staff development training in the state of Nebraska, particularly in the area of technology use and incorporation across the curriculum. Additional examples of staff development funded by the competitive grants include funding for implementing new primary curriculum, for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the classroom, for dealing effectively with at-risk youth, for improving math and science instructional practices, and for mentoring first-year teachers.

The SEA houses an Education Technology Center that facilitates districts' efforts in planning and implementing their instructional technology plans. The Technology Center worked with ESU staff development specialists to form the Internet Integration Partnership (IIP), which is comprised of several work groups that are creating training opportunities and instructional resources for school staff. Over 80 percent of all K-12 educators have Internet accounts and have received at least one day of training on the Internet. The initial Internet network system was purchased jointly by the SEA and the Nebraska Math and Science Initiative (see below). Technology Center services are supported through state funds and a grant from the US WEST Foundation.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Nebraska Math and Science Initiative (NMSI) is the state's Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI), which is funded largely by a grant from the National Science Foundation. NMSI provides professional development opportunities for teachers through its Promoting Excellence in Education Regionally and Statewide (PEERS) Academy. The Academy sponsors peer-led workshops and follow-up sessions for approximately 1,000 teachers each summer. Although the SSI grant expires in 1997, estimates are that nearly 40 percent of all secondary-level math and science teachers and 17 percent of all elementary teachers in Nebraska will have attended the PEERS Academy by September, 1997.

Nebraska initiated a Goals 2000 program in January of 1995. According to federal guidelines, 90 percent of Goals 2000 funds must be subgranted directly to local education agencies (LEAs) or a consortia of LEAs or ESUs for the purpose of school improvement activities. Among these activities, staff development and preservice education are identified as top priorities. The SBE has established reading and writing instruction as the focus for 1996-97 Goals 2000 subgrants. Over \$1 million was awarded to LEAs and ESUs for the professional development of teachers in these areas. Goals 2000 funds are also being used to support the Nebraska PreK-12 Technology Plan, approved by the SBE in the spring of 1996, which sets forth an agenda to "advance excellence in Nebraska's education systems through the coordinated use of technology" and calls for the development of minimum technology competencies for teachers. A set of suggested minimum competencies are now in place for pre- and post-service teacher training.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Three years after the inception of the Nebraska Lottery, over \$23.4 million in education grants have been awarded, a portion of which has been used to support staff development. The Nebraska legislature appropriated \$13 million (LB860) to establish a School Technology Fund to provide school-based technology grants and support the SEA's Technology Center. Funds for Internet connections are awarded on a competitive basis to schools at the rate of \$50 per teacher. The Nebraska Department of Energy has provided \$500,000 to promote science and energy education through the PEERS Academy and through grants to individual teachers and communities.

Federal Funds. Nebraska received \$567,422 in Goals 2000 monies in 1994, \$1,986,104 in 1995, and \$1,835,986 in 1996. The state also received \$1,132,388 in Eisenhower funds in 1995; in 1996, it received \$1,938,890 from the Title IV Safe and Drug Free Schools program and

\$1,768,454 from Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title VI-Innovative Education Program Strategies. Each of these grant sources support programming for professional development at the state and local levels.

Local Funds. Local districts, through a tax levy, provide the primary support for professional development in Nebraska. Statewide, approximately \$500,000 per year has been collected since 1992 to support ESU technology-specific staff development services. Schools that receive Internet connection funds from the state are required to provide matching support at \$50 per teacher.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Nebraska encourages teacher professional development by requiring local schools districts to provide a minimum of ten hours of professional development per year. Typically, local school districts design appropriate professional development activities to support school improvement processes or initiatives underway in the school or district. However, formal professional development plans and/or planning committees are not required at the local level.

Because of the small size and isolated nature of many of Nebraska's districts, professional development is often provided with the assistance of ESU staff. There are minimal state requirements for professional development; as a result, it is the responsibility of administrators, teachers, other school staff members, and local boards to recognize the need for additional training and information. Regional structures help coordinate activities and maximize limited funds, but professional development designed for building level implementation of instructional improvement is limited.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Nebraska does not have a state-funded tuition reimbursement program; however, such reimbursement may be

made available to teachers through local bargaining agreements or at the discretion of local districts.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA) hosts an annual Summer Leadership Conference. The conference features an array of seminars that cover topics ranging from best practices for inclusion and multicultural education to conflict management and membership rights. During the school year, NSEA staff and consultants are available to respond to technical assistance and training requests from districts.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) is collaborating with several school districts and individual schools to provide professional development opportunities for teachers. UNL's Teachers College is working with four partner schools to identify effective ways to prepare teachers to work in today's schools and to explore questions and problems of mutual interest to the schools and the college. At Roper Elementary School (Lincoln), Teachers College faculty work collaboratively on site with school staff to design a set of "model" practicum experiences for teacher education students who are assigned to teaching teams at Roper. The partnership with Benson High School (Omaha) focuses on developing an induction program to assist new teachers during their first and second years of teaching. The induction process begins at the student-teacher level. Staff at Southeast High School (Lincoln) have been working with Teachers College faculty to develop articulation strategies from middle school through high school and to equip students for the transition to postsecondary studies. A fourth partnership is with Millard Lefler Middle School (Lincoln), where UNL faculty and school staff have designed practicum experiences for middle-level teachers. The partnership is also developing approaches to help middle school students attain the more

advanced social skills that are important to school success.

The UNL Department of Special Education and Communication Disorders (SECD), in partnership with Lincoln Public Schools and Lancaster County Head Start, established a professional development school (PDS) in 1993. UNL students representing disciplines such as early childhood special education, nursing, music education, and consumer and family sciences work in classrooms at Barkley Memorial Center, where approximately half of the student population is identified as having disabilities ranging from mild to severe. The PDS classrooms are entirely inclusive; all physical, occupational, and speech-language therapies are provided within the context of daily classroom routines. PDS partner organizations collaboratively supervise UNL students. This partnership also spawned an Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) and Head Start program at SECD. The program seeks to develop collaborative programs for the delivery of services to young children; to encourage interchange between faculty and staff at the three programs, thereby fostering professional development at each site; to improve pre-professional programs in speech-language pathology and early childhood special education; and to explore, in conjunction with the SECD, the possibility of extending the program to other pre-professional programs.

Contacts/Information Resources

Mary Ann Losh
Administrator
Staff Development and Instructional Strategies
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
402-471-4357

Robert Crosier
Administrator
Teacher Certification Office
Nebraska Department of Education
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509-4987
402-471-2497

Jay Sears
Director of Instruction Advocacy
Nebraska State Education Association
605 South 14th
Lincoln, NE 68508
402-475-7611

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Nevada

Number of Teachers: 12,579
 Average Years of Experience: 13
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%
 Average Salary: \$37,181¹

Education Policy Context

Nevada, currently the fastest growing state in the nation, faces interesting challenges in setting education policy. The state has 17 counties, each with one school district. The number of students is increasing swiftly, and new legislation curtails rapid growth in class sizes among certain elementary grades, compounding the need for more teachers and the need to streamline the credentialing system to place teachers quickly in classrooms. In 1995, the state legislature allocated \$245,000 to the Nevada Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to automate some functions of the Office of Teacher Licensure. The State's Commission on Professional Standards in Education (CPSE) is considering adopting alternative routes to certification, and has approved reciprocal license agreements with other states.

The state Board of Education (SBE) is addressing three priority areas: examination of proficiency-based graduation standards, which would have major implications for teacher classroom performance; drop-out prevention and kindergarten for all students; and using school-to-work initiatives and Nevada's Goals 2000 grant to drive systemic change in the state. The SBE is also developing new assessments for students in grades 4, 8, and 11.

The SEA is being restructured into six new divisions, or Leadership Teams, each having a key focus. Three divisions relate to professional development: one Leadership Team focuses on standards, curriculum, and assessment; another focuses on educational equity; and a third on human resources and teacher licensure.

The State Role in Professional Development

Nevada does not have a statewide professional development plan for teachers. The CPSE was established in 1987 to prescribe licensure requirements for all education personnel.

The CPSE is a semi-autonomous commission staffed by the SBE; the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction serves as the SEA liaison to the Commission. The SBE can disapprove any CPSE-adopted regulation within 90 days, but thus far the SBE has never vetoed a CPSE regulation.

Teacher Certification Policies. Individuals who successfully complete a teacher education program at an accredited university are eligible for an initial five-year license. During this five-year period, teachers must complete six semester hours of college coursework or the equivalent in professional development credits, and must meet testing requirements if they have not done so

previously. This license must be renewed every five years.

Professional Licenses are offered to educators with three years of teaching experience and a master's degree. The Professional License must be renewed every six years. Renewal is contingent upon completion of six semester hours of college coursework or the equivalent in professional development credits.

State-Supported Programs. There is no state plan for teacher professional development in Nevada, and no state oversight of local professional development activities. Some SEA divisions offer workshops and in-service programs, upon request, or deliver information on specific state programs and initiatives. The Office of Teacher Licensure manages the logistics and paperwork of teacher certification and renewal. The state is automating the recertification functions, and when this process is complete, teacher licenses will be maintained in a centralized computer database. All schools in the state should be able to access this information.

Nevada previously maintained a state system of professional development centers organized around the state's 17 school districts. However, this system lost state funding during a period of budget difficulties in 1991. The Douglas and Clark Counties have managed to maintain their professional development centers with their own resources and outside funding.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

The Education Coalition is a statewide consortium of education-related groups facilitated by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The consortium includes the Nevada Education Association, the Nevada School Boards Association, the Nevada Administrators Association, the PTA, among others. The Education Coalition meets regularly throughout the legislative session and has addressed the issue of teacher professional development.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Nevada is a Goals 2000 state and uses these funds to support local education reform, professional development for teachers, and preservice education. Goals 2000 funds also support Nevada's Comprehensive State Improvement Plan, which addresses standards and assessment for students and includes a professional development component.

School-to-work initiatives are helping to drive reform in the state. Businesses are encouraged to assist local school districts with professional development activities.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Although there is no state income tax, state funds cover approximately 60 percent of public education costs. Federal funds constitute approximately 4 to 5 percent of education funding, and local taxes provide the balance. There is no line-item in the state education budget for teacher professional development activities. A sum of \$245,000 was allocated in the 1995 legislative session to the SEA to automate the functions of the Office of Teacher Licensure during the 1995-97 biennium. Also allocated was \$4 million for school-to-work initiatives, including some support for professional development. The legislature allocated \$5 million to the University of Nevada to expand distance learning and technology efforts.

Federal Funds. The state receives Eisenhower funds and Title I and Goals 2000 grants that are distributed to local districts for professional development.

Nevada received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funds in FY 1995. In Year 2 of Goals 2000, Nevada received \$1,419,052, of which 90 percent was distributed to local school districts for reform efforts, including teacher professional development. Second-year funding from Goals 2000 also provided subgrants to local districts. For example, in Year 1, the Clark County School district (Nevada's largest district, which includes Las Vegas), the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and the local professional development center received \$49,632 to improve and coordinate long-term professional development.

Federal tech-prep funds support partnerships between community colleges and local districts in technology education. These partnerships have professional development components for teachers.

Local Funds. The state does not mandate local budget set-asides for professional development activities. Districts fund their own activities as resources allow, with amounts varying widely by district.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Although Nevada has no specific requirements for teacher professional development, districts are allowed to use up to three days each year for district-sponsored, in-service activities approved by the SEA. The three days are part of the state's mandated 180-day calendar. Districts usually use all three days for professional development. An SBE-appointed Task Force on Secondary Education recommended that ten days be dedicated to professional development each year, but the legislature has not set aside funds for this purpose.

Many districts have been involved in the creation of professional development plans as part of the Goals 2000 initiative. However, the implementation of these plans is not mandatory. Many districts have their own professional development staff, and provide districtwide training, regardless of the

presence or absence of state encouragement or federal programming. The primary providers of staff development services at the district level are district staff, universities, and the SEA.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teachers can negotiate for professional development, such as sabbaticals and release time to pursue courses and other activities, on the local level.

Teachers may receive salary increments based upon the completion of college coursework and other professional development activities. These policies vary from district to district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Nevada Education Association provides professional development for teachers upon request, and its local chapters provide training for members. The Nevada Education Association works at the state level to help inform policy, and is a member of the Nevada Education Coalition.

Nevada's institutions of higher education are a major source of professional development for the state's teaching force. They provide in-service activities and college coursework for teachers, and contribute to a unique system of partnerships between community colleges and local districts. Community colleges receive federal tech-prep funding to administer articulated technology classes with high schools, and provide funds for teachers to pursue professional development in technology and other areas. Institutions of higher education work closely with the SEA to provide training as needed. The state university system is seeking funding from the legislature to improve the technology needed to deliver professional development to teachers in rural and remote areas of the state.

Through the state's school-to-work initiative, many businesses have begun to provide professional development opportunities for teachers of banking,

manufacturing, health services, and construction. Businesses have offered summer externship programs for teachers in their local school districts.

Contacts/Information Resources

Doug Stoker
Director of Teacher Certification
Nevada Department of Education
1850 East Saharra, Suite 207
State Mail Room
Las Vegas, NV 89158
702-486-6455

Christina Harper
Secretary
Nevada Commission on Professional
Standards in Education
700 East 5th Street
Carson City, NV 89701-5096
702-687-9226

Debbie Cahill
Nevada Education Association
1890 Donald St.
Reno, NV 89502
800-232-6732

¹ Sources: *National Resource Data Center* and *National Center for Education Statistics*, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

New Hampshire

Number of Teachers: 11,972
Average Years of Experience: 15
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 36%
Average Salary: \$34,121¹

Education Policy Context

New Hampshire is a small state with 176 school districts and 459 schools enrolling 185,360 students. State funds account for only approximately 8 percent of public education costs in New Hampshire. Local revenues support over 83 percent of the funding, and the balance is provided by the federal government (less than 3 percent), tuition costs for students who transfer from outside districts (approximately 5 percent), and the sale of bonds. It is, therefore, difficult for the state to exercise direct authority over schools in such a context of strong local control over education policy.

In the early 1990s, property-poor school districts filed a lawsuit alleging that the state did not provide adequate education opportunities for their students. The state supreme court referred the matter to a lower court for a full hearing, which began in May of 1996.

Despite the lawsuit and strong local control, New Hampshire is implementing a statewide education reform initiative. The New Hampshire Education Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP) was established by the state legislature in 1993, including new curriculum frameworks for grades K-12 in social studies, English, math, and science (which have been completed) and new standards-based student assessments. Since 1994, two rounds of testing have been

administered in grade 3, and one round each in grades 6 and 10. The new assessments follow from the curriculum frameworks and contain a mix of multiple-choice questions, open-ended questions, and writing samples to evaluate students' knowledge and their ability to apply that knowledge. Student outcomes are classified as novice, basic, proficient, or advanced. The state has publicly released the results of the new assessment, which are based on achievement categories, not percentiles. There has been a great deal of public interest in the results, and personnel at the New Hampshire Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) expect the results will encourage districts to adopt the new curriculum frameworks.

The SEA has posted a Frequently Asked Questions document on its home page (<http://www.state.nh.us/doe/education.html>) describing the intended use of the new assessment program:

"The assessment is not designed to compare students, schools, and districts. Instead, it is designed to promote local and statewide educational accountability and to provide data to drive long-term educational improvement. The new program sets higher expectations for student academic achievement in New Hampshire, but it will take time for schools to fully implement a

plan for curriculum and instruction to meet the challenging standards identified in the curriculum frameworks.

Assessment results from the first three or four years will be used by local schools and the state to identify areas that need improvement and to aid in the design and implementation of educational improvement activities. Each year, as more and more data on students performance is collected, schools will be able to focus improvement plans where they are needed most. Starting with the fifth year of results, schools, districts, and the state will use assessment data to chart the long-term impact of educational improvement efforts."

The State Role in Professional Development

Although New Hampshire is a traditionally "local-control state" in terms of education policy, there is definite movement at the state level to effect systemic improvements in the schools. SEA assistance to local districts in implementing the NHEIAP consists of: a continuing series of workshops and informational meetings about NHEIAP; technical assistance to districts who request help in the development of local improvement plans

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

(District Educational Improvement Plans, or DEIPs); and providing "support and staff development activities to help schools incorporate the curriculum frameworks, understand the assessment results, integrate test results with other data on student performance, and share successful instructional practices."

Staff development has been a continuing focus in New Hampshire public education. The state eliminated life-time certification for educators in 1974 and set professional development requirements for maintaining teaching credentials. The state requires districts to establish staff development committees to ensure that personnel plans comply with state recertification requirements. The SEA has restructured itself in keeping with the NHEIAP so that school improvement tasks, including professional development and quality control, are united in one division to ensure coordination at the state level.

Teacher Certification Policies. After completing an approved teacher preparation program, new teachers are granted a Beginning Educator Certificate from the SEA. There are no special professional development or evaluation requirements for new teachers in New Hampshire. The Beginning Teacher Certificate and the Experienced Educator Certificate have the same professional development renewal requirements. The Beginning Educator Certificate is valid for three years, during which teachers must complete 50 clock hours of professional growth activities according to the following requirements: 20 hours must be spent in the endorsement area; five hours must be spent in character and citizenship education; and five hours must be spent in professional skills, knowledge of learners and learning, school organization, or exploratory and innovative activities. A draft rule under consideration would require five hours of educational technology and Internet use. The SEA has established guidelines to help educators determine what types of activities satisfy the requirements.

After completion of these requirements and three years of successful teaching experience, educators are granted an Experienced Educator Certificate. The advanced certificate is also valid for three years and has identical requirements for professional development activities. This system has been in effect since 1978.

State-Supported Programs. Two advisory boards work with the New Hampshire State Board of Education (SBE). The Professional Standards Board is appointed by the SBE to advise on teacher credentialing, and includes representatives of the SEA, classroom teachers, education specialists, higher education, and community members. The Council for Teacher Education makes recommendations to the SBE on standards for teacher education programs.

The SEA is developing a system to provide technical assistance in comprehensive educational reform to local education agencies and institutions of higher learning. This collaborative system includes private providers and other public agencies. Currently, the SEA is focusing on assisting school districts in the development of DEIPs, the district plans for implementing the NHEIAP at the local level.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. New Hampshire is not participating in Goals 2000.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state budget for professional development.

Federal Funds. Most of the funding in the state for professional development is from federal sources, such as Chapter 1 or Eisenhower grants. In FY 1995, New Hampshire received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funds. New Hampshire also received special education and vocational education money from the federal government.

Local Funds. Local funds, varying greatly from district to district, are reported to be the next largest source of support for professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The SEA has encouraged districts to develop local improvement plans. The content of the plans is rooted in the 1993 NHEIAP law, which encouraged each local school district to develop school improvement goals and comprehensive plans to implement its goals, specifying programs, priorities, and concerns including professional development. Districts are encouraged, but not required, to submit their plans to the SEA for review. The state goal is to assist districts in enhancing student academic performance and achievement.

Districts are expected to report data on professional development in their Consolidated Applications, which the SEA began using as a basis for awarding funds to districts in the 1996-97 school year. This application will be used to award funds from Titles I, II, IV, and VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Eventually, all funds will be requested through this process.

The SBE requires districts to establish staff development committees; the SEA performs an on-site review of the committees every five years. Committee members are selected by local election and are responsible for establishing districtwide plans for meeting the six professional growth areas determined by the SEA.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teachers can bargain for professional development locally, but not at the state level. Teachers negotiate for funding for professional development and for higher salaries tied to advanced degree work.

District generally reimburse teachers for the costs of completing recertification requirements. When the state offers training sessions, it may provide a small stipend to cover the costs of substitute teachers and travel. College tuition reimbursement and salary increments for professional development vary by district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The National Education Association-New Hampshire chapter (NEA-NH) provides a significant portion of teacher professional development opportunities in the state. The NEA-NH offers workshops throughout the school year and hosts an instructional convention each October that includes approximately 100 different workshops for educators. The NEA-NH gives a state-level voice on professional development by supporting initiatives that would provide training or sabbaticals. The state also has an American Federation of Teachers affiliate that advocates professional development for teachers.

Other teacher organizations provide professional development opportunities. The New Hampshire Science Teachers Association organizes an annual conference for its members, Tech-Prep Teachers Association, other subject-matter organizations, and the New Hampshire chapter of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development provide professional development for their members.

The state university system provides professional development through college coursework. Keene College and other private colleges maintain partnerships with local schools and provide tailored staff development services.

The Center for School Services at the Center for Resource Management (CRM) is a private company in South Hampton that specializes in training, organization, program development, research and evaluation. Considered to be one of the major resources for teacher

professional development in New Hampshire, CRM was awarded a grant from the state legislature to work with schools planning systemic improvements. When the grant money was cut from the state budget, CRM continued its work with local schools.

Contacts/Information Resources

Joanne Baker
Administrator
Division of Education Improvement
New Hampshire Department of Education
101 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301
603-271-3870

Martha Cray-Andrews
Center for School Services, CRM
2 Highland Road
South Hampton, NH 03827-3607
603-394-7040

Fred Place
New Hampshire Education Association
103 North State St.
Concord, NH 03301
603-224-7751

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

New Jersey

Number of Teachers: 85,564**Average Years of Experience: 18****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 37%****Average Salary: \$45,582¹**

Education Policy Context

New Jersey's public education system serves over 1.1 million students in nearly 600 school districts. It operates according to a long-held tradition of local control. Until recently, the state focused on school finance, state assessment, technical assistance, and accountability. A high-stakes accountability system, in place since 1978, was based on skills performance and compliance with state regulations and included state intervention. The Monitoring Law of 1991 directed the New Jersey Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to develop state performance standards and revise its monitoring and accountability systems in accord with the standards.

The *Comprehensive Plan for Educational Improvement and Financing* was issued by the SEA as an interim report in February of 1995 and finalized in May of 1996. The Plan provides the State Board of Education (SBE) response to the July 1994, New Jersey Supreme Court ruling which declared the state's school funding formula inequitable and unconstitutional and ordered the government to close the spending gap between the poor "special needs" districts and the state's wealthiest districts by September of 1996. The Plan would define a "thorough and efficient education" through the development of

curriculum standards, and determine the funding levels that guarantee a thorough and efficient education in all school districts.

The Strategic Plan for Systemic Improvement of Education in New Jersey, issued by the SEA in June of 1995, identifies 11 goals for improving student achievement: developing an educational mission statement; developing curriculum standards; safety; deregulation; accountability; revising the state monitoring system; revising policies for professional development and certification; increased resources for instruction; public engagement; instructional technology; and developing model systems.

In May of 1996, the SBE adopted core curriculum standards for language arts/literacy, mathematics, science, social studies, world languages, health/physical education, and visual/performing arts. The standards serve as frameworks for what students are expected to know and be able to do at the end of the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. Districts are not required to align their curricula to the standards. However, state assessments (a proposed 4th-grade test, an 8th-grade Early Warning Test, and the 11th-grade High School Proficiency Test) will be redesigned and linked to the standards. Student performance on these assessments will be the primary criteria for determining rewards or sanctions under the proposed accountability system.

The State Role in Professional Development

Although the state has traditionally had limited involvement in setting standards or guidelines for professional development, professional development and certification is one of the goals in the Strategic Plan. Policy revisions affecting the preparation and certification of new teachers have yielded great improvement, according to the SEA plan, but "the state has not paid comparable attention to the continuing professional development of practicing teachers."

In July of 1993, the SBE formed a Professional Development Committee, which recommended that the SEA adopt a "required professional development plan for all New Jersey certificated school personnel measured in hours and excluding a grandfather clause." The goal is providing quality professional development opportunities focused on improving student achievement of curriculum standards. The plan is expected to be submitted to the SBE during the 1996-97 school year.

Teacher Certification Policies. The SEA Office of Professional Development and Licensing is responsible for the policies, programs, and services that govern the preparation, licensure, and professional development of public school personnel. The Office coordinates all licensing activities and monitors local professional development for

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

the purposes of licensure. The Office conducts research on staff supply, demand, quality, and related issues. The Office is funded by revenues generated by licensure and training fees.

Upon meeting all preservice requirements and receiving a contract of employment, beginning teachers are issued a one-year Provisional Certificate. Since 1992, new teachers have been required to participate in a one-year induction program that provides training, support, and supervision by a professional support team. The induction program includes formal evaluations (by the principal), classroom observations, teacher feedback conferences, and coaching. A positive end-of-year recommendation from the principal permits the teacher to advance to the Standard License, which is valid for life. Teachers with Standard Licenses must participate in an annual evaluation process that includes preparing an individual professional development plan.

The New Jersey School Boards Association (NJSBA) has proposed a recertification system requiring teachers to complete 180 clock hours of professional development activity every five years to renew their standard certificates. NJSBA recommends that an optional Master Teacher Certificate be instituted. The New Jersey Education Association (NJEA) is opposed to recertification and recommends instead that teachers be required to obtain a master's degree as part of their preservice preparation in order to receive a permanent certificate. The Governor has expressed interest in revising the certification code. The SEA has been exploring recertification and will make recommendations to the SBE.

State-Supported Programs. In 1978, the New Jersey legislature created a network of four regional Education Improvement Centers (EICs) to provide training and technical assistance to districts. Each EIC was governed by a local board representing administrators, teachers, school board members, and parents. The EIC structure was modified in 1982: one EIC (South Jersey) became a separate entity with its own board and supported by a variety of funding

sources; the other EICs became part of a new delivery system to provide assistance on major state initiatives.

The new system, instituted in 1983, consists of Regional Curriculum Service Units (RCSUs) directly administered by the state. At the same time, the SEA created the Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Management (AATM). In 1990, the RCSUs and the AATM were merged into the Academy for Professional Development, which has three regional centers (Academies North, Central, and South). Managed by the SEA Division of Field Services, the academies "deliver professional development services to accomplish SEA initiatives; build local capacity for school improvement and professional development; provide effective training in various content areas; broker services for specialized needs; and stay in the vanguard of educational thought and practice."

The Academy publishes an annual brochure of teacher training services. Districts may register for individual training activities or choose to enroll in the Academy's Affiliate Program, which entitles them to a variety of staff development services. Budget cutbacks have forced the centers to share a team of mathematics and language arts curriculum specialists. A funding proposal has been recently submitted to the legislature, requesting nine additional professional staff positions for the Academy.

The SEA Office of Innovative Programs created a clearinghouse on best practices to assist school districts, teachers, and parents in obtaining information on programs and practices that promote high student achievement.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. New Jersey has incorporated Goals 2000 into its Strategic Plan. Nearly 90 percent of the Goals 2000 funds are dispersed at the local level through competitive subgrants. One subgrant area focuses on developing and enhancing partnerships between colleges and districts to "assist in the academic preparation of teacher candidates and support the training needs of current and prospective teachers."

The New Jersey Statewide Systemic Initiative (NJ SSI), entitled "Achieving Excellence in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education," is a partnership among the SEA, elementary and secondary schools, Rutgers University, and other state resources. Partnership activities are organized into two program components. Thrust One consists of 13 partnerships between elementary school systems and institutions of higher education. Approximately 200 K-8 teachers each year receive training to strengthen their instructional skills in mathematics, science, and technology. Thrust Two involves 33 districts in systemic reform activities that focus on the teaching of science, mathematics, and technology. Activities are closely linked to the state's core curriculum standards. Initiated in 1993, NJ SSI activities are funded through a five-year National Science Foundation grant (\$2 million annually), with supplemental support from the state (\$1 million), federal Eisenhower funds (\$1.8 million), and the Merck Institute for Science Education.

The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation sponsors the Summer Opportunity for Teachers program, initiated in 1985, which provides competitive mini-grants for teacher travel and other independent study activities conducted during the summer. To date, the Foundation has committed \$1.5 million to this initiative, which has awarded grants to over 300 New Jersey teachers.

The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation also funds the Dodge Fellowship program, administered through the SEA. This program provides competitive grants to outstanding alternate-route teachers to fund the costs of professional training and formal instruction during their first year of teaching.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. In 1995-96, the state appropriated \$1 million to support the Academy for Professional Development regional centers. Funding for the Office of Professional Development is generated entirely through certification and

training fees. Districts do not receive state aid specifically earmarked for professional development. However, the SEA Comprehensive Plan identifies professional development as an essential "associated cost" and recommends that districts adopt the private industry standard (2 percent of salaries) and budget one substitute day per teaching position.

The majority of the operating funds (80 percent) for the Educational Information and Resource Center come from federal and foundation grants. It also receives an annual state appropriation of \$450,000.

Federal Funds. New Jersey received an \$8.7-million Year 2 Goals 2000 grant and a \$6-million Eisenhower grant in 1995-96. These two federal programs support the Academy for Professional Development and are the primary funding sources for local staff development.

Local Funds. Local budget expenditures for professional development are discretionary and vary by district.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The SEA requires districts to develop and implement a multi-year professional development plan; however, they are not mandated to budget for this activity. The law stipulates that the plan should be based on teaching staff needs, linked to student performance, integrated with curriculum development, and evaluated. As of the 1993-94 year, all districts are required to develop and implement an induction-year program that guarantees every provisional teacher training, mentoring support, and supervision to help meet the qualifications for permanent licensure. The SEA issues guidelines but does not provide funds to support these local programs.

The state does not set a minimum number of in-service days for districts. Most districts provide two in-service days per year, and two additional days to accommodate teachers who want to attend the annual NJEA convention.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development opportunities are negotiated at the district level through collective bargaining agreements. Teachers advance on negotiated salary scales, based on the accumulation of college or in-service credits. Many districts award or acknowledge in-service credit based on clock hours. Every 15 clock hours is the equivalent of one college credit; 15 college credits are typically needed to advance on the salary scale. Most districts provide some level of tuition reimbursement for teachers.

The Strategic Plan criticizes the current incentive system for professional development because it "emphasizes the quantitative accumulation of college and inservice credits" to advance on negotiated salary scales. The plan proposes that incentives be assigned based on improved student performance related to the standards.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

NJEA spends \$4.7 million annually on its professional development programs. Each November, the NJEA sponsors a two-day conference that attracts 40,000 teachers to the workshops offered by NJEA and affiliated subject-matter organizations. NJEA conducts between 12 and 14 single-theme professional development conferences throughout the year. In 1981, the NJEA created the Professional Development Institute, which maintains a registry of quality professional development providers, endorses programs, documents teacher participation, showcases outstanding programs, and assists districts in surveying teacher needs and interests in professional development. NJEA is planning to expand its professional development program by using part-time training consultants and teachers with expertise in selected instructional areas.

The Educational and Information Resource Center (EIRC) was created in 1967 by a group of educators in southern New Jersey. EIRC initially focused on grant-writing assistance to districts but quickly expanded to provide technical assistance in response to district requests. EIRC's statewide services include school improvement planning, curriculum development, staff development, teacher exchange programs, grant-writing assistance, the National Diffusion Network, and the New Jersey Geographic Alliance. More than 250,000 teachers, administrators, students, and parents participate in EIRC activities annually. EIRC became a state agency in 1978 and still receives some state support.

The Merck Institute for Science Education (MISE) was founded in 1993 to enhance student knowledge and interest in science and science-related careers by using inquiry-centered science and mathematics curricula and instructional technology. MISE is conducting Leader Teacher Institutes for teachers in three New Jersey districts, training teams of teachers in the content knowledge and skills needed to transform teaching and learning.

Rutgers University established the Consortium for Educational Equity in 1975 to assist schools with implementing reforms to promote the full achievement of all students. The Consortium uses professional development to target the effects of gender, race, national origin, language, culture, socioeconomic status, and disability. The Consortium also manages the Center for Family Involvement in Schools, which provides school staff with model programs and training in how to actively involve parents in their children's learning. The Center has developed programs that have reached over 650 schools, 1,400 teachers, and 30,000 families statewide.

Montclair State University (MSU) sponsors a professional development school initiative in collaboration with the NJEA and the National Education Association. The Clinical Schools Network was initiated in 1987 in response to MSU participation in the John Goodlad Project. The Network pairs education students with classroom

teachers to promote collegial discourse and application of critical thinking skills. Participating classroom teachers make a three-year commitment to serve as "clinical adjunct faculty" at the college and to attend workshops throughout the year while serving as mentors for student teachers. Fifteen districts are involved in the network; a total of 170 teachers have participated.

In 1992, the School of Education at Rowan State University established a Professional Development School (PDS) partnership with Cooper's Poynt Elementary School in Camden, placing education students in classrooms and giving Cooper's Poynt teachers opportunities to conduct classroom research with Rowan faculty. Two additional PDSs have been developed subsequently at Woodrow Wilson High School in Camden and Evergreen Elementary School in Woodbury. Rowan State University houses the Thomas E. Robinson Beginning Teachers Induction Center (BTIC), which opened in 1988. The Center provides support services to beginning teachers via seminars, workshops, clinics, and other activities. BTIC provides technical assistance and mentor training to surrounding school districts. The Center has served over 1,800 beginning teachers and trained 400 mentor teachers from public and private schools in southern New Jersey.

The Institute for Arts & Humanities Education (IAHE) was established in 1982 as the Arts Foundation of New Jersey. This non-profit organization fosters arts and humanities education through programming such as INTERARTS™ and Teacher Institutes. INTERARTS provides training in interdisciplinary techniques to school personnel. INTERARTISTS conduct on-site staff development, in-service sessions and residencies during the school year. IAHE's summer Teacher Institutes provide training in interdisciplinary curriculum models that center on a historical theme and include the arts as an integral curriculum component. Teacher Institutes are taught by a faculty of distinguished college and university professors from around the country and abroad. Participating

teachers are awarded \$1,000 fellowships, attend follow-up seminars during the school-year, and often continue to work together through regional Academic Alliances.

Contacts/Information Resources

Ida Graham
Director, Professional Development and Licensing
New Jersey Department of Education
CN 500
Trenton, NJ 08625
609-984-1216

Academy for Professional Development
Academy North—Robert Ozak, Director
201-266-8660
Academy Center—Dolores Keezer,
Director-908-225-4545
Academy South—Arthur Spangenberg,
Director-609-468-5530

Peg Lawlor
Associate Director for Instruction and Training
New Jersey Education Association
180 W. State Street
Trenton, NJ 08607
609-599-4561

Ron Zucca
Associate Director
Educational Information and Resource Center
606 Delsea Drive
Sewell, NJ 08080
609-582-7000

Rebecca L. Lubetkin
Executive Director
Consortium for Educational Equity
Rutgers University
Building 4090 - Livingston Campus
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
908-445-2071

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



New Mexico

Number of Teachers: 18,404

Average Years of Experience: 13

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 44%

Average Salary: \$27,922¹

Education Policy Context

New Mexico's K-12 public education system serves a culturally, geographically, and economically diverse student population, approximately one-third of whom attend school in the Albuquerque district. The remaining 88 school districts are located in smaller, rural communities in which local control over education policy has been maintained. For several years, the State Board of Education (SBE) has been establishing high expectations for students in New Mexico, and the Public Reform Act of 1986 represented the New Mexico legislature's attempt to establish an educational vision. The reform was comprehensive in nature, addressing issues such as class size, leadership roles for teachers, licensure requirements, attendance and graduation requirements, expanded testing, and learning competencies. Several initiatives have followed, all of which value the integrity of collaboration, while maintaining a commitment to local planning.

The New Mexico State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) appointed committees to identify education standards for New Mexico schools and to develop frameworks for exit competencies for 12th-grade students, which were adopted in 1992 as components of the *Education Standards for*

New Mexico Schools Standards for Excellence. Writing committees composed of teachers, administrators, college faculty, parents, and others have drafted half of a set of state content standards, with benchmarks at grades K-4, 5-8, and 9-12. Once adopted by the SBE, local districts and schools will be required to align locally developed curricula with the content standards.

A new school accreditation process designed to support the district's Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) is in effect. The SEA is developing a technical assistance document to facilitate teachers' understanding and application of the standards. Professional development activities are being planned to enhance the understanding and teaching of the content standards. The activities will be offered to teachers, administrators, local school board members, and parents.

Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education (CITE) represents a student-centered policy framework for promoting student learning to meet state standards. Revised by the SBE in 1993, CITE links federal, state, and local education system priorities under eight central goals: (1) assuming shared responsibility for education; (2) providing learning opportunities to all students; (3) setting high standards for all students; (4) offering teacher professional development and recognition; (5) providing adequate and equitable fund-

ing; (6) establishing student-centered learning environments; (7) increasing local decision making; and (8) requiring performance accountability. State policies to support local school improvement continue to be refined, as evidenced by the New Mexico Education State Improvement Plan (adopted in 1995) and recent legislation regarding charter schools, education technology, and work readiness. On June 12, 1996, the legislature and Governor Gary E. Johnson appointed a 30-member Public Education Strategic Planning Team—comprised of leaders representing education, business, community, and government—and charged them with developing a "statewide strategic plan for New Mexico public schools." The Team will issue its first report to the SBE before the onset of the 1997 legislative session.

The State Role in Professional Development

Legislative committees, as well as SBE-appointed panels, have researched and proposed new policies to support the professional growth of New Mexico's educators. The Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) was formed in 1965 to study education policies and school finance issues for the state. For the past five years, the LESC has reviewed New Mexico's policies and practices regarding teacher professional development and has led state efforts to

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

institute a Professional Development Act that would mandate districts to design and submit an annual professional development plan to the SBE and provide state funding for local plans. First introduced in 1994, the proposed legislation included a state allocation for site-level planning (see "Public Funding" below).

Other state-level groups have yielded recommendations that mirror LESC's position. The Systemic Change in Education Advisory Committee (SCEAC) was created by the Governor and the SBE in 1993 to converge the various strands of New Mexico's education reform initiatives into a comprehensive education improvement plan. SCEAC issued a report in 1994 which recommended that state set-aside funds be allocated to support district-level professional development planning and implementation. Similarly, an SBE-appointed, 19-member Blue Ribbon Panel on Professional Development examined professional development opportunities available to New Mexico public school educators, reviewed the relevant research, and provided recommendations. Based largely on teacher and administrator survey data and other national research information compiled by SCEAC, the panel issued a report in September of 1994, entitled *Criteria for Professional Development in Schools*. The report emphasized the need for ongoing professional development that is directly linked to school reform and financially supported at every level of the education system. Despite the complementary nature of the recommendations and the consensus of action emerging from them, New Mexico has yet to fund a systemic initiative that would support district activity in this area.

Teacher Certification Policies. The 19-member Professional Standards Commission is appointed by the SBE and serves an advisory role on matters related to teacher licensure and relicensure, approval of preparatory programs, and professional conduct and ethics. The Commission is composed of five classroom teachers, two school administrators, four community/business representatives, the state director of licensure, a designee for the state

superintendent, and a representative from each of the following categories: special service personnel, non-teaching school personnel, college faculty, a college of education dean, and technical college and private school personnel. In 1989, the SBE adopted the Commission's proposal to establish educator competencies and restructure New Mexico's teacher licensing policies into a three-tier, performance-based system that aligns certification renewal with the demonstrated achievement of these competencies.

After meeting all preservice requirements, entry-level teachers are issued a provisional Level I license. The Level I license is non-renewable and valid for three years. Teachers may advance to a Level II license after one year, if they pass a performance evaluation (see below). Since 1989, Level I teachers have participated in a New Educator Support Program that provides non-evaluative mentoring, and districts are required to implement this program. Mentors, who must be at least Level II certified or be a college faculty member, receive training from the district before serving in a support capacity. Implementation structures for new teacher support programs are determined at the local level. The SEA issues program and mentor training guidelines, but state funds are not allocated specifically for this activity.

The Level II license is valid for nine years and may be renewed upon satisfactory completion of the performance evaluation. Level III-A is an optional, nine-year license that is awarded to teachers who obtain a master's degree and satisfy the requirements of the performance evaluation.

Educator competencies have been established and performance evaluations are required for all certified school personnel. Districts are required to design a teacher performance evaluation program that measures "essential teaching competencies" in nine skill areas: (1) content knowledge; (2) teaching methods; (3) communication; (4) principles of learning; (5) student assessment; (6) classroom management; (7) diversity awareness; (8) reflection and modification; and (9) collegiality. Competency indicators vary according to licensure

level, with Level III-A competencies denoting more advanced teaching and professional skills. Performance evaluation plans are designed locally (in adherence with state guidelines) and must be approved by the SEA. The evaluation consists of personnel orientation and training in performance evaluation techniques, classroom observations, pre- and post-observation conferences, and other forms of data collection.

The evaluation is intended for formative and summative use. On a formative level, teachers receive feedback at various points during the year that is used to implement and refine their individualized professional development plans (PDP). The PDP is developed by the teacher in consultation with the evaluator and is updated yearly. The district must assist teachers in carrying out their PDPs by providing guidance, workshops, classes, or other resources as needed. The evaluation is summative in that results are used to determine licensure upgrades and renewal, as well as continued employment.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA School Program and Professional Development Unit provides technical assistance to local districts. Staff from this office are organized into two-member teams to work in particular regions of the state. These teams are able to respond to assistance requests in the areas of curriculum development, assessment and evaluation, licensure policies, and compliance regulations, among others.

The SEA operates ongoing state-wide training programs for teachers. Held each summer, the Leadership Institute offers three-day workshops focusing on various pedagogical topics or "strands" of interest. The Institute was created in 1984 to provide training for teachers and administrators in supervision and evaluation, based on the components of the state plan. Since then, Institute activities have been expanded to serve district administrators, school board members, and parents. Institute topics cover a variety of interests (e.g., education technology, implementing standards for excellence, and multiple intelligences) and are

designed to reinforce New Mexico's teacher and administrator competencies. The workshops are estimated to attract over 300 participants per year.

The SEA also administers "special projects" in professional development, such as the New Mexico Law Related Education Project (NML-RE), Mediation in the Schools, and the Indian Education Center for Excellence. Each project provides ongoing opportunities for teacher training and professional growth.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Using federal Goals 2000 funds, the SEA offers competitive professional development grants to consortia and individual districts. During the 1994-95 school year, two district consortia received grants.

The Systemic Initiative in Math and Science Education (SIMSE) was created in 1991 through a \$10-million Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation and through supplemental federal Eisenhower funds. SIMSE activities are based in five regional centers. Participating teachers attend SIMSE summer institutes and receive technical assistance throughout the year from regional center staff. Over 120 schools (representing 780 trained teachers) are implementing new and innovative mathematics and science curricula based on the SIMSE model.

New Mexico participates in the national Re:Learning program and has created a strategic planning process, entitled *Shades of Change*, to implement the Re:Learning principles of effective schooling. Re:Learning New Mexico provides technical assistance to schools, districts, and communities that are engaged in needs assessment and strategic planning. The process focuses on five indicators of change: (1) teaching and learning; (2) leadership; (3) school-community partnerships; (4) multilevel support systems; and (5) communication. In 1995-96, 126 schools representing 29 districts participated in Re:Learning; in 1996-97, the number increased to 139 schools representing 23 districts. Participation in *Shades of Change* activities can be used to satisfy the state's new accreditation requirements (see below). Re:Learning New

Mexico activities are funded through a state appropriation and a grant from the Noyce Foundation.

Rockefeller Foundation grants are being used to sponsor two major professional development projects. The New Mexico Academy for School Leaders provides training that promotes the role of teachers as leaders of and contributors to educational renewal efforts. New Mexico's largest district, Albuquerque Public Schools, is one of a select group of districts in the country to receive a Rockefeller Foundation professional development grant.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item for professional development in the existing state education budget. However, the LESC study estimated that, in the 1995-96 school year, \$2.4 million in state funds (as assigned through special projects and district operational budgets) was used for teacher professional development at the state and local levels. This figure accounts for approximately .02 percent of the state's total education budget. Re:Learning New Mexico is funded through a special state appropriation, which totaled \$900,000 in 1995-96 and \$800,000 in 1996-97.

The proposed Professional Development Improvement Act would have provided a \$4.5-million state appropriation for district-level professional development programs. In 1995, the legislature partially funded the bill, approving a \$445,000 appropriation that would provide time and resources for districts to create a professional development plan. However, this amendment was later vetoed by the Governor because funding was not available within the existing school finance formula. A similar bill, proposed during the 1996 legislative session was also vetoed by the Governor.

Federal Funds. New Mexico received a \$2.7-million Goals 2000 grant for 1995-96. Approximately 90 percent of these funds was allocated to local districts through competitive grants for the areas of school improvement, profes-

sional development, and preservice training. Federal Eisenhower funds for the 1995-96 year totaled \$1.9 million and were used for professional development in mathematics and science.

Local Funds. The SBE grants schools the authority to assign monies from other operational funding strands (e.g., Title I, special education, and state-supported special projects) for professional development activities. There are no restrictions or mandatory requirements placed on districts in this regard. A 1995 LESC survey of superintendents revealed that federal (\$4 million statewide) and state-supported (\$2.4 million statewide) special projects accounted for 78 percent of all funds used for district-sponsored professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Under the new accreditation process, each district is required to develop an EPSS. Districts are encouraged to focus all professional development on attaining the goals of their EPSSs. Districts have responsibility for assisting all certified personnel in implementing their individual PDPs. The SEA has created a professional development planning guide that districts may use as a reference source.

In 1994, the SEA distributed a survey to a randomly selected group of teachers and school administrators and all superintendents. One year later, an LESC survey yielded responses from 65 New Mexico school districts (representing 73 percent of all districts). Both surveys included questions about local professional development activities. Over 70 percent of respondents to the SEA survey identified a lack of time, while 58 percent cited a lack of money, as being factors that inhibit professional development. LESC's survey determined that districts allocate from one to as many as 12 days for in-service activities during the school year, with an average of 3.7 days across all districts. Since 1987 (when three in-service days were eliminated from the state school year

calendar), districts have had to negotiate locally for additional time by extending the school day and/or the contract year. The most frequently cited topics for district-sponsored, in-service activities are technology, pedagogy and classroom management, child/substance abuse, and special education and inclusion.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salary incentives for continued graduate education and other types of professional development are determined at the local level. Since 1974, the state has used an Instructional Staff Training and Experience (T&E) Index to allocate funds for teacher salary supplements (although districts are not required to use the money for this purpose). By statute, the T&E Index is calculated based on the weighted average of a district employee's recognized years of teaching experience and level of academic training: bachelor's plus 15 credits, bachelor's plus 45 credits, master's, master's plus 15 credits, master's plus 45 credits, or post-master's degree. Each district receives an allocation based on FTE estimates.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

In 1990, the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) established a policy that would fund "extended services" instruction to encourage New Mexico's colleges and universities to provide off-campus instructional activities. LESC's survey data revealed that an overwhelming number of districts identified distance learning services offered through New Mexico institutions of higher education and other organizations as a source of professional development.

Contacts/Information Resources

Paula Sass Donnelly
Director of School Programs and Professional Development
New Mexico State Department of Education
Education Building - Capitol Complex
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-827-6572

Pauline Rindone
Deputy Director
Legislative Education Study Committee
State Capitol, Room 418
Santa Fe, NM 87503
505-986-4591

Marilyn Scargall
Director of Professional Licensure
New Mexico State Department of Education
Education Building - Capitol Complex
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-287-6581

Publications and Reports

"Professional Development in the Public Schools." Report issued by the Legislative Education Study Committee (October 1995).

Criteria for Professional Development in Schools: Recommendations of the New Mexico Blue Ribbon Panel on Professional Development. New Mexico State Board of Education (1994).

New Mexico Professional Development School/District Planning Guide. New Mexico State Department of Education (Winter 1994 - Draft).

Performance Evaluation Plan for Licensed Personnel: A Technical Assistance Manual. New Mexico State Department of Education (Winter 1994).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



New York

Number of Teachers: 179,413

Average Years of Experience: 16

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 68%

Average Salary: \$45,772¹

Education Policy Context

New York's 714 school districts serve approximately 2.7 million students. The state's large size and its emphasis on local control have made education an ostensible "fourth branch of government." Education policy is set primarily by the New York Board of Regents (the State Board of Education, or SBE) and the Commissioner of Education. A new Commissioner of Education, appointed in 1995, launched several new initiatives, including transformation of the state student assessment system from a minimum competency test to a rigorous examination. The New York State Education Department (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is revising its curriculum frameworks: the resulting "Learning Standards" were adopted by the SBE in July of 1996.

The New Compact for Learning, an initiative of the previous Commissioner, was adopted by the SBE in 1991, and is still operative in New York State. The New Compact established goals for all students in the state and set forth a strategy for meeting these goals.

The state allows teachers up to five school days for professional development. An additional calendar day was allotted to districts for professional development activities specific to the New Compact for Learning. The state

also supports a large network of Teacher Resource and Computer Training Centers that serve the professional development needs of many teachers and administrators.

In 1993, the state amended certification regulations to require satisfactory performance by elementary teachers (grades pre-K through 6) of the common branch subjects and secondary teachers (grades 7 through 12) of the academic subjects on the newly developed New York State Teacher Certification Examinations. This teacher assessment program has four major components: the Liberal Arts and Sciences Test (LAST); the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W); the Content Specialty Tests (CSTs); and the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Performance (ATS-P).

The State Role in Professional Development

There is currently no statewide plan for professional development in New York. However, professional development is part of the discussions about the new curriculum frameworks and student assessment initiatives. The State Teacher Education Certification and Practice Board, including representatives of public school teachers, teacher educators, and the broader educational community, is involved in professional development. The Board serves in an advisory capacity to the SBE on teacher

licensing, program approval, and teacher practice. The Board recently made recommendations regarding teaching assessments, revising teacher licensure standards, implementing and funding Teacher Resource and Computer Training Centers, and researching the performance of educators certified through approved programs.

The Office of Elementary, Middle, Secondary, and Continuing Education (EMSC) has outlined professional development activities that support local capacity-building for raising student standards. An EMSC staff member works with the Teacher Centers. The EMSC action priorities for the 1995-96 school year (listed on the SEA Web page, which contains information regarding education initiatives), include:

- conduct workshops and provide field information on curriculum frameworks and assessments, including prospective timelines for implementation (ongoing);
- expand the number of School Quality Reviews and self-reviews and train reviewers to participate in self-reviews (ongoing);
- coordinate staff development opportunities for teachers on curriculum frameworks, instructional technology, school safety, school-to-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

work transition, Goals 2000, School Quality Reviews, and similar educational reform initiatives (ongoing);

- collaborate with the SEA Office of Higher Education and the Professions on teacher preparation requirements that support education reform initiatives (long-term).

The state supports a regional system of Boards of Cooperative Education (BOCEs) that provide a variety of services to local school districts, including workshops and other professional development opportunities for teachers. BOCEs offer their services to groups of school districts for a fee. Districts which wish to purchase services from a BOCEs can obtain state Cooperative Services Aid to help offset the expense.

Teacher Resource and Computer Training Centers were established as a state organization by law in 1984. There are 117 Teacher Centers serving either single districts or consortia of districts. The Centers have their own geographical network for collaborating and sharing resources. Approximately 650 of the state's 714 districts belong to a Teacher Center. Centers apply every year for funding from the legislature; an SEA staff member oversees their budgets, progress, and activities, but does not monitor them. Local needs assessments determine the offerings of Teacher Centers. Teacher representatives appointed by local bargaining agents make up at least 51 percent of the Centers' local policy boards; other members include school board members, parents, higher education representatives, and representatives of a business or industry related to computers.

Teacher Certification Policies. New York State has a two-stage certification process, with an initial certificate valid for five years and a permanent certificate valid for life. To earn the initial or provisional certificate, teachers undergo two assessments. The first is a test in the liberal arts and sciences (the LAST) that includes a writing component. The second is the Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written (ATS-W), a test of pedagogical knowledge that also contains a writing component.

To be eligible for a permanent certificate, teachers are required to obtain a master's degree in a field related to their teaching service. Candidates for permanent certification must also perform satisfactorily on a Content Specialty Test (CST) and on a video assessment of classroom teaching performance (a 30-minute videotape of teaching performance). The videotape is rated by at least two permanently certified teachers according to rigorous review and calibration guidelines that assure validity and reliability. Strict and explicit directions require that the videos must be unedited, and strongly recommend that videos not be submitted before a teacher has been in service for at least two years.

A Mentor Teacher-Internship Program was piloted in New York State between 1986-87 and 1990-91. Although program funding was discontinued by the state legislature, a number of sites have attempted to maintain a semblance of the program with their own resources. The New York State United Teachers (NYSUT) has called for the SEA to support legislation that would provide funding to reinstate the program.

State-Supported Programs. Teacher professional development issues generally fall under the SEA's EMSC. Certification comes under the Office of Teaching. The state supports professional development for educators through workshops in specific programmatic areas, such as special education and bilingual education.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. New York has received a Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF), called the New York State Mathematics, Science and Technology Urban Network Project. The Project is aligned with the goals of the New Compact for Learning and seeks comprehensive reform in the areas of science, math, and technology. Career-long professional development for teachers is part of the overall initiative. Through SSI and Eisenhower funding, the state sponsors summer workshops on school restructuring, student assessment, and constructivist pedagogy. The NSF also funds an Urban Systemic Initiative in

New York City which has a professional development component. New York City has also received a grant from the Annenberg Foundation.

New York is a Goals 2000 state. The state disperses competitive grants to institutions of higher education, school districts, and collaboratives for local improvement planning and implementation, preservice education, and professional development. New York is a member of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium and receives Eisenhower funding for various projects.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state budget allocating funds for professional development to districts according to formula. The Teacher Centers received \$15 million in FY 1997 and \$12.5 million in FY 1996 (a decrease from \$17 million in FY 1995). BOCEs have a line item in the state budget, but their work is not exclusive to professional development. The state maintains a fund, Cooperative Services Aid, to help offset district costs of purchasing staff development from BOCEs.

Federal Funds. The state receives Eisenhower grants, funding from the federal School-to-Work program and Goals 2000 funds. In FY 1995, the state received \$18,820,412 in Eisenhower funds. In its second year of School-to-Work funding, the state received \$10 million, a portion of which was used for professional development activities. In Year 2 of Goals 2000, the state received \$27,112,295, of which approximately \$18,800,000 was allocated for professional development.

Local Funds. The state does not mandate a local budget allocation for professional development. Local funds pay for a significant portion of professional development resources in fees to BOCEs and Teacher Centers, and for teacher reimbursements.

Foundation Funds. NSF funding for the SSI project in Year 2 (1994-95) totaled \$2.4 million, of which at least \$337,000 was spent on professional development summer institutes.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Districts are not required to develop staff development plans to be reviewed by the SEA. Some districts negotiate professional development plans with their local bargaining units. Districts that wish to participate in Goals 2000 must develop staff development plans as a part of their grant applications.

The state does not mandate a minimum number of days for professional development, but most districts set aside days for such activities. The four days known as "superintendent conference days" are typically used for staff development; these can be counted as days of attendance for state aid purposes. The fourth day was added for district activities that specifically support the New Compact for Learning.

Teacher Centers and BOCES are the primary sources of professional development resources for local districts. The Teacher Centers provide services based on a needs assessment of teachers in member districts. BOCES serve groups of school districts by providing services or resources for a fee; one of these services is staff development. School districts that purchase staff development from a BOCE can receive state Cooperative Services Aid to help offset the cost.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The inclusion of professional development clauses in local bargaining agreements in New York State is relatively common. Many districts incorporate their requirements for the teacher professional development into the local agreements.

Reimbursement of teachers' expenses for professional development varies by district. College tuition is not generally reimbursed, although travel expenses and payment for teachers' time are covered by many districts. Districts often provide release time for teachers to pursue professional development.

Teachers receive salary increments tied to professional development activities and college credits, although these policies vary from district to district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The state's teacher organizations actively work to influence policy regarding professional development. They lobby in support of continued funding for Teacher Centers, and, NYSUT has called for the SEA to request renewal funding for the Mentor Teacher-Internship Program.

Teacher organizations offer extensive professional development opportunities for their members. The NYSUT Effective Teaching program offers college-level courses serving approximately 10,000 teachers each year. Teachers pay a fee to attend the "non-theoretical, hands-on, and research-based" courses. NYSUT co-sponsors an annual in-service conference with the SEA. Each content-area teacher organization in the state offers professional development opportunities for its members.

Institutions of higher education play a major role in teacher professional development in the state, particularly because teachers are required to earn master's degrees to obtain permanent certificates. Buffalo State has a professional development school, and other institutions of higher education work with local districts.

Local professional development initiatives serve the needs of educators in their immediate areas, and collaborate on statewide activities. The Capital Area School Development Association, for example, is an independent study council working with 118 regional districts to provide professional development. NYNEX and General Electric provide funding for various local professional development activities.

Contacts/Information Resources

Dr. Charles Mackey
Administrator
Teacher Certification Policy
Office of Teaching, Room 5A-11
New York Department of Education
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12234
518-474-6440

Isabel Pickett
Associate in Teacher Education
New York State Department of Education
Teacher Center Program Office
Room 379-EBA
Albany, NY 12234
518-473-1234

Charles Santelli
Director of Policy and Programs
New York State United Teachers
159 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12212
518-459-5400

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

North Carolina

Number of Teachers: 69,421

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 35%

Average Salary: \$29,727¹

Education Policy Context

North Carolina's K-12 public education system consists of 100 county and 17 urban school districts, 1,984 schools, and over one million students. Education policies emphasize strong state control and regulation to ensure local quality.

In 1995, the General Assembly of North Carolina passed legislation that, in effect, gave the State Board of Education (SBE) authority over the Department of Public Instruction (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). The SBE was charged with examining the structure and functions of the state's public school system. The SBE report to the General Assembly presented a framework for restructuring public education, and precipitated the enactment of a 1995 law that revised existing statutes governing the SEA and placing it under the sole jurisdiction of the SBE.

SEA departments were consolidated into three service divisions: instructional and accountability services; information and technology resource services; and finance and personnel services. Staffing was reduced by nearly 50 percent—a move that saved \$20.9 million annually for local-level and other agency use. State allocations for local staff development programs were doubled. Funding for state-operated professional development programs was adjusted

and, in some cases, eliminated. The restructuring provided local systems with increased resources and choices in identifying and selecting professional development suited to their needs.

The SBE created a new state assessment and local accountability system. Student performance in grades 3-8 are measured annually in reading, writing, and mathematics. A high school assessment and accountability plan will be implemented in 1997-98. Bonus money will be awarded to administrators and teachers in schools where students demonstrate improvements in test scores. The state will intervene and possibly assume control over schools with consistently low test-score performance.

The State Role in Professional Development

The North Carolina Education Cabinet was created in 1993 to provide a collaborative forum and to set forth a comprehensive vision for education. In November of 1995, the Cabinet released a draft report outlining strategic directions for a sound educational system: accountability; financial and program flexibility; continual/seamless learning; universal access; high expectations; collaboration; and technology.

The Cabinet identified six areas as the foundation of the comprehensive plan, one of which addresses teacher

professional development. The draft report recommends that public education sectors work collaboratively to "develop a consolidated Teacher Inservice and Support System for the state." The system should focus on training in content and performance standards, methodology and delivery models, uses of technology, learning styles, continuing support and renewal, just-in-time training and help-desk functions, and certification of providers. The Cabinet is expected to present to the General Assembly during the 1996-97 school year a strategic plan for carrying out these directives for full implementation by the year 2005.

A 1996 review, conducted by the School Management Study Group (SMSG) at the University of North Carolina, of nine state-supported professional development programs, may help guide the development of the strategic plan. The study concluded that increased effort should be made to ensure better coordination and collaboration of professional development initiatives. The report cited the lack of evaluative data to assess the impact of these programs on public schools. SMSG made the following recommendations:

- **Accountability.** State-funded programs should be required to develop a mission statement and an

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

implementation work plan and to submit an annual report (including an evaluation component) to the legislature.

- *Coordination.* A Professional Development Council composed of the directors of professional development programs and an SEA representative should be established.
- *Governance.* An external review of all professional development programs should be conducted and, where necessary, governance structures should be modified to ensure effective operations.

As a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, North Carolina will undergo a teacher development policy inventory, which will help in developing a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The SBE is authorized to set policy on teacher licensure. The Professional Practices Commission, created by the General Assembly in 1987, advises the SBE on the preparation and licensure of public school personnel. The SBE-appointed, 14-member Commission is comprised of seven K-12 classroom teachers, three public school administrators, and four college/university representatives. The Commission gives North Carolina educators a greater voice in shaping policy decisions that affect their profession. The Commission sponsors reports that examine issues identified by the SBE and the state's educators.

North Carolina has had a two-tiered system of teacher licensure since 1985. Entry-level teachers receive a two-year, non-renewable Initial License; they must participate in the Initial Licensure Program (ILP), which consists of an orientation session, mentoring support, and an evaluation process called the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal System. The ILP was designed to be an extension of teacher education programs and to support professional growth during the first two years of employment.

The ILP is currently being "reimagined," and pilot efforts are underway to create a performance-based system. The new assessment will incorporate Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards and a teaching portfolio. The portfolio will include an individual professional development plan (PDP) designed by the teacher and mentor, and documenting activities that have been completed. PDPs will identify areas of need and outline the in-service strategy to strengthen skills in targeted areas. SEA-trained Performance Review Teams will determine continued licensure. The SEA is developing guidelines and materials to support new ILP activities. The SEA monitors local ILPs, provides technical assistance, and evaluates ILPs, but each district is responsible for local program funding, implementation, and mentor training.

Upon successful completion of the ILP, teachers receive a Continuing Certificate that is valid for five years. Teachers must earn ten semester hours or 15 renewal credits within each five-year cycle in order to be recertified. Renewal credits are awarded for participation in district-sponsored or other state-approved training, workshops, or conference activities.

North Carolina provides extensive incentives for National Board Certification. Since 1994, the state has paid the assessment fee (\$975) and provided up to three days of paid leave during the school year. Completion of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) portfolio process satisfies renewal credit requirements for one renewal period. Successful candidates receive a four percent salary increase. Any out-of-state Board-certified teachers are automatically eligible for certification in North Carolina. North Carolina has 118 Board-certified teachers, the largest number of any state.

State-Supported Programs. Various divisions within the SEA provide teacher training activities. The recent restructuring of the SEA eliminated the eight Technical Assistance Centers (TACs) that provided training and other technical assistance to districts. The estimated \$6 million per year that

supported the TACs has been redistributed among districts in the form of block grants. The SBE allows districts to pool resources and form Regional Educational Service Alliances which serve many TAC functions, but are more customer-driven in their programming. Districts that do not join may broker and select professional development and technical assistance resources on their own.

The North Carolina Teacher Academy provides intensive and high-quality training experiences to meet the demands of education reform and standards for student learning. The Academy was established based on recommendations from the Teacher Staff Development Task Force, appointed by the General Assembly and the governor to develop a program to provide training in site-based management skills, content-area instruction, technology for instruction, and strategic planning. The state-funded Academy offers an intensive, one-week summer residential training experience, and has served more than 5,000 North Carolina educators since 1994. The Academy's director estimates that 40 percent of all North Carolina schools have sent teams to its activities. The Academy's trainer-trainee model each year develops a cadre of 70 to 100 "teacher trainers" who work as presenters for the summer program and provide technical assistance to districts during the school year. Academy activities are offered at ten university-based locations across the state, and there is no charge for participation. The Academy conducts two follow-up training sessions at each participating school site during the school year. Formerly administered by the SEA, the Academy is now autonomous, operating from the central administration office of the University of North Carolina.

The School Technology Commission was created in 1993 to develop a state plan for using technology in schools. Its 1995 recommendations to the legislature resulted in a \$42 million appropriation for computers and other instructional technology resources. Ten million dollars in recurring and \$10 million in non-recurring funds were appropriated in 1996. The Commission

recommended that 20 percent of this allocation be used for staff development. In 1995, the School Technology Users Task Force developed a regional professional development delivery model for mastering a set of technology competencies, based on standards set by the Association of Educational Communication and Technology and the International Society for Technology in Education. The plan was implemented in the summer of 1996. Participation is voluntary.

The state funds eight Educational Consortia that were created by the legislature in 1991. The university-based consortia provide technical assistance and training to local districts.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. Goals 2000 funds support university-school partnerships, many of which provide professional development for teachers. East Carolina University and three county districts are implementing a peer coaching program. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill partnership with the Chapel Hill-Carrboro City School System created the Constructing Outstanding Mathematics Experiences for Teacher and Students program. Goals 2000 professional development subgrants ranged from \$75,000 to \$200,000 in 1995-96.

The North Carolina Science and Mathematics Alliance was created in 1991 to implement a \$7.8-million Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation. The five-year strategic plan focused on a collaborative model for finding new ways to bring mathematics and science into alignment with the state's goal of higher standards and increased student performance. The plan included support for Alliance-sponsored teacher training programs.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The 1995-96 state education budget included: \$3.8 million for the Teacher Academy; \$764,073 for the Clinical Teaching Network; \$3.4 million for the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching; \$6.9

million for the School Leadership Academy (a training program for administrators); approximately \$700,000 for National Board Certification incentives; \$1.4 million for the Educational Consortia and the Mathematics and Science Education Network; and \$6 million for the TACs (eliminated in 1996-97). The state provided districts with funds for professional development at \$100 per FTE. This amount was increased in 1996-97, when TAC money was redistributed.

Federal Funds. North Carolina received a \$7.7-million Year 2 Goals 2000 grant in 1995-96. Ninety percent of this funding was distributed to school districts and higher education institutions for reform planning, staff development, and preservice education initiatives. The state's 1995-96 Eisenhower grant totaled \$5.3 million. State officials report that federal programs provide the bulk of staff development funds available at the local level.

Local Funds. Beginning in 1996-97, districts will receive state block grants for professional development. These are not mandated set-asides; they may be used for in-service, or other activities, as determined by local boards.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The School Improvement and Accountability Act of 1989 directed the SBE to develop and implement guidelines for developing a local performance-based accountability plan (PBAP). PBAPs were optional. Districts that participated—first through school system-based student performance and accountability plans and later through building-level plans—were allowed additional budget flexibility, could request waivers of state laws and regulations, and received funds for differentiated pay.

In 1995, the General Assembly repealed differentiated pay and charged the SBE with proposing an accountability model that would improve student performance and increase local flexibility and control. The SBE proposal, known as the ABC's plan, became law in 1996 as

the School-based Management and Accountability Program. This program is a natural expansion of PBAP. Unlike PBAP, however, the School-based Management and Accountability Program requires schools and school systems to participate and holds the personnel at each individual school accountable (through rewards and sanctions) for the academic performance of its students. This is now the driving force for professional development in the state.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

North Carolina is a right-to-work state in which collective bargaining is prohibited. The state salary schedule sets step increases based on teaching experience and graduate degrees earned. North Carolina teachers who obtain National Board Certification are awarded a four percent salary increase, the equivalent of two step increases.

Participants in the Teacher Academy receive a \$500 honorarium upon completion of the program. The Academy's teacher trainers receive a salary of \$1,200 per week for their work during the summer. Teachers generally do not receive stipends or reimbursement for participation in in-service activities.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The North Carolina Association of Educators (NCAE) operates a Professional and Organizational Development Department that offers a variety of in-service opportunities. NCAE presentations and workshops are conducted by a field staff of "Uniserve Consultants" who respond to district and school requests for training. NCAE sponsors two statewide, three-day Instructional Professional Development workshops each year, and a special one-day program to help teachers prepare for National Board Certification. For every ten hours of NCAE training, a teacher is eligible to receive one unit of renewal credit towards recertification.

The North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching (NCCAT) was established in 1985 by state law. Based at the University of North Carolina, NCCAT provides a year-round series of residential seminars. Training activities are free of charge and take place on or off campus. The activities include renewal seminars, teacher-scholar residencies, team building, and professional development programming. According to a 1994-95 annual report, approximately 4,000 teachers participate in NCCAT seminars each year, representing 75 percent of all North Carolina schools. State funding is supplemented by contributions from individuals and foundations.

The Model Clinical Teaching Network involves 12 colleges and universities and 67 school districts. The Network was created by the legislature in 1987 to provide a teacher development continuum from preservice clinical experience through career-long professional development. The Network is entirely funded by the state.

The University of North Carolina Mathematics and Science Education Network (MSEN) was created by the legislature in 1984 to improve mathematics and science instruction. MSEN operates ten centers on university campuses throughout the state. It conducts in-service activities on math/science instruction and curriculum development and sponsors a pre-college program targeted at increasing math/science interest among minority students. Funds to support MSEN are provided primarily through Eisenhower grants and a state appropriation.

The University of North Carolina System is implementing a network of university-school teacher education partnerships to create clinical school settings for the preparation, induction, and continuing professional development of educators. Full implementation is expected by 2000.

Contacts/Information Resources

Weaver Rodgers
Executive Director
North Carolina Board of Education
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919-715-1322

Julia Kron
Director
The Teacher Academy
200 Meredith Drive, Suite 201A
Durham, NC 27713
919-560-5454

Gloria Bowman
Coordinator
Professional Practices Commission
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601
919-715-1146

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Reports and Publications

A Report on the Operation, Organization and Governance of Selected North Carolina Programs Established to Provide Continuing Education and Professional Development of Public School Teachers and Administrators. Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina (April 15, 1996).

The Continuing Professional Development of Teachers in a Learning Society. North Carolina Professional Practices Commission (May 1994).

The Initial Certification Program: An Investment in Good Teaching. North Carolina Professional Practices Commission (May 1991).

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



North Dakota

Number of Teachers: 7,755

Average Years of Experience: 15

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 18%

Average Salary: \$25,506¹

Education Policy Context

North Dakota, like many other states, is striving to create a public education system that will prepare students for the twenty-first century. In March of 1990, the North Dakota Education Action Commission was formed, bringing together leaders from the public and private sector to create a forum for developing a consensus regarding education issues in the state. Months of public meetings, along with a review of national research, ultimately led to a "package" of bills, introduced in the 1991 legislative session, intended to restructure all aspects of the state's educational system. Of all the bills presented, however, only portions of two were approved for inclusion in the North Dakota Century Code (NDCC). These additions address participatory decision making and student performance standards and assessment. The legislature charged the Department of Public Instruction (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to prepare for the development of student performance standards and matching assessments, which would be implemented during the 1993-95 biennium (although no state funding was provided to support this activity). The legislature also charged local districts with adopting a policy and a plan for implementing participatory school decision making. Timelines were

amended in 1993 (HB 1467), delaying implementation until the 1997-99 biennium; both mandates were repealed in 1995.

The SEA did, however, work with teacher-based committees in 1992-93 and, with the help of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL), produced curriculum framework documents in the following areas: arts education, business education, languages, health, physical education, language arts, library media, mathematics, science, and social studies.

In 1994, the SEA was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to revise the language arts curriculum frameworks document. The new English Language Arts (ELA) Framework was completed in 1995, and training for teachers in the development and use of performance-based assessments subsequently began. This training, along with other activities related to the implementation of the ELA standards, is being supported by another grant that the SEA received from the U.S. Department of Education.

The State Role in Professional Development

North Dakota first adopted a state model for professional development in 1986, based on recommendations issued by the North Dakota Teachers' Profes-

sional Practices Commission (TPPC). In adopting the TPPC's recommendations, the SEA reported:

The expressed purpose of this statewide model is to manage professional growth and development as if it were important...to devote the time and attention needed to coordinate needs and services among the major participants so that professional growth activities are both effective and efficient. This devotion is needed to tie together state and local needs, to coordinate services, to evaluate the quality of services and most importantly, to move away from piecemeal practices that have decidedly limited impact on the growth of educational professionals.

The model reflects a holistic approach that addresses a continuum of professional growth dimensions: personal professionalism, through individually initiated and funded growth experiences; academic training, through formal and structured educational experiences; guided practice, through professional coaching; climate, regarding the intellectual and physical environment; empowerment, through supportive policies and funding; and personal wellness, stressing attention to personal needs. Although funding was not provided,

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

districts were encouraged to develop a local professional development plan based on this model.

In 1993, the legislature created the Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB), which was established in July of 1995 and replaced the TPPC. Unlike its predecessor, the ESPB is an autonomous entity authorized to set policies pertaining to teacher certification and professional conduct, as well as to approve teacher preparation programs. Board members are appointed by the governor and consist of four public school classroom teachers, one private school classroom teacher, one school board member, two school administrators, and one college of education dean.

The ESPB makes recommendations for teacher in-service activities and has recently completed a two-year process that involved over 1,400 educators and community members. This collaborative effort produced *The Professional Development Guidelines: Effective Practices*, a document that is being used to promote the effective use of professional development as a tool to drive the continuous improvement of education.

The Guidelines can be used to assess an entire curriculum, a specific course, or a sustained professional development process. Currently, districts are being encouraged to use the Guidelines voluntarily as part of their strategic planning. However, it is anticipated that eventually they will be

incorporated into the North Central Accreditation (NCA) process. A state-wide delivery model is currently being implemented to provide training for school staff on the application of the Guidelines (see below).

Teacher Certification Policies. Beginning teachers receive a two-year Entrance Certificate. After two years of contracted services, teachers may obtain a Professional Certificate, which is renewable every five years. Requirements for renewal include a minimum of 30 days of teaching experience, four semester hours of college credit, and three positive recommendations from supervisors.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA provides a full range of professional development opportunities for regular and special education teachers and administrators, auxiliary personnel, parents, and school board and community members. SEA staff respond to professional development requests from the following sources: an individual, unit, or division within the SEA; special education units; or Teacher Center staff (described below).

North Dakota has ten Teacher Centers, which were established in 1978, that provide support services to local districts. Each Center is staffed by a part-time director and governed by a locally elected board. Center directors, who are convened at least three times each year, comprise the Teacher Center

Network. An SEA staff member serves as the liaison to the network. Teacher Center services are supported through district fees and state funds.

The SEA Office of Instructional Support has a Special Projects Unit that is responsible for providing technical assistance and in-service training to local board members and district- and school-based personnel. Professional development activities sponsored through this unit focus on civil rights desegregation, equity issues, multicultural education, and HIV/AIDS education; other activities have included special programs, such as the English Language Arts Collaborative and the English Language Arts Assessment projects (see below).

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The state-level Goals 2000 Professional Development Committee targeted a portion of grant funds to support training in the application of ESPB Professional Development Guidelines. Teams representing each of the Teacher Centers, along with ESPB staff and Goals 2000 Professional Development Committee members, attended a two-day training session to learn how to use the Guidelines; team members are now providing turnkey training to districts. Districts that request information regarding the Guidelines will receive a full year of training sessions.

Goals 2000 planning and implementation subgrants are available, on a competitive basis, to school districts to support local educational improvement, professional development, and preservice teacher education. Goals 2000 funds are also being targeted to address the needs of Native American learners and the development of standards in the areas of Native American language and culture. The state is giving preferences in awarded subgrants to district consortia as a way of encouraging greater collaboration and coordination among local systems.

Two recent major U.S. Department of Education grants gave the SEA impetus in implementing professional development programs focused on English/language arts. In 1993, a three-year grant from the Fund for Innovation in

The Professional Development Guidelines: Effective Practices

The Guidelines are centered around the following eight principles, which state that effective professional development is:

1. connected to identified vision, mission, and goals;
2. sustained and continuous;
3. a process which, throughout, promotes participation of all partners;
4. based on valid research and proven theory;
5. learner-centered and focused on the participants;
6. modeled upon and demonstrates effective teaching strategies for transference into the classroom;
7. inclusive of coaching and/or mentoring support; and
8. assessed through feedback and documentation of participant and student outcomes.

Education (FIE) was used to implement the English Language Arts (ELA) Standards Project. This project represented a collaborative effort among public and private schools, institutions of higher education, and professional organizations to improve the teaching and learning of English/language arts through the development of detailed, content-specific frameworks; a pilot trainer of trainers model; and the development and dissemination of certification and recertification guidelines for teachers of English. Each year, teams of teachers and administrators attended a two-week summer institute and then provided 15 hours of turnkey training to colleagues at their school sites during the year. Eight schools piloted the training component in 1994, and 16 districts participated in 1995. With additional funding support from Title I in 1996, a group of educators representing public and private schools, institutions of higher education, and SEA staff also received training. Approximately 400 teachers experienced an in-depth review of the ELA Curriculum Framework and of alternative assessment writing, including rubrics. Participants in standards development and training activities earned graduate credits.

In 1996, North Dakota received a follow-up, four-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education to fund the ELA Standards-Based Assessment Project, which is supporting teachers in the development, field-testing, and evaluation of state tests in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. North Dakota's education community (including approximately 450 teachers) will be involved in developing the assessments and determining their validity. During each year of project, the designed assessment will be field tested.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not earmark funds for local professional development. The legislature appropriates \$200,000 per biennium for the ten Teacher Centers. The SEA allocates \$3,700 in contracts for each Teacher

Center to conduct HIV/AIDS education training. The Center for Innovation in instruction (see below) receives funding through an SEA contract of \$139,000 and a line-item allocation of \$50,000 from Valley City State University.

Federal Funds. Federal programs have been credited for supporting much of North Dakota's standards development and teacher training activities. The U.S. Department of Education provided a \$694,000 grant for the ELA Standards Project from 1993 to 1996; a follow-up grant of \$1,576,643 funds the ELA Assessment Project from 1996 to 1999. Some supplementary funding from Title I was used to implement the 1996 summer institute. During the 1995-96 year, North Dakota received a \$1.3-million Goals 2000 grant and a \$1.2-million Eisenhower grant.

Local Funds. Districts rely heavily on federal programs such as Title I, Title VI, and Title II to fund professional development activities. Allocations for teacher in-service activities are made at the discretion of the district, based on identified school improvement needs, and vary accordingly.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Since 1980, local systems have been required to maintain North Central Accreditation. As such, districts must submit a school improvement plan to the State Board of Education every five years. Professional development is a required component of the plan. The school-year calendar must provide a minimum of 180 instructional days. Many districts add five discretionary days, some of which are used for in-service activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The state teacher salary schedule is based on the accumulation of advanced degrees, college credits, and continuing education units (CEUs). In rare instances, tuition reimbursement may be

awarded, as determined by local collective bargaining agreements.

Teachers participating in ELA Standards and Assessment projects received stipends for their development work and summer institute training.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The North Dakota Education Association (NDEA) is a primary professional development provider. Every October, the NDEA hosts a two-day Instructional Conference, which features keynote presentations by leading education experts and professional development workshops covering a variety of issues. In 1943, legislation was passed to close schools during the NDEA conference, which attracts over 4,000 teachers per year. Throughout the school year, NDEA conducts sectional meetings focused on subject-matter and pedagogical areas. NDEA also sponsors summer activities, including an annual conference and several regional workshops.

Many NDEA activities are implemented through the Teacher Centers. Three years ago, NDEA began a local capacity initiative that allows NDEA staff to work extensively with four or five districts each year to research and design a 15-hour professional development module. Participants of NDEA training events are eligible to receive CEUs.

The Center for Innovation in Instruction (CII) was created in 1993 to promote the use of instructional technology in North Dakota's schools. Housed on the campus of Valley City State University, CII offers a variety of professional development services by working with district consortia to identify local needs and interests. In addition to customized training, CII sponsors an annual Technology Leadership Conference, conducts regional workshops, houses an instructional technology Review Center, and publishes the quarterly *Innovator* newsletter that is distributed to every teacher in the state. CII uses a "train the trainer" delivery

model that enables districts to maintain ongoing professional development. The Center is staffed by a director, an assistant director, two training coordinators, and a field network of consultants. CII has several funding sources, including the University, the SEA, and district fees.

The Greater Barnes County Consortium was formed in 1994. The Consortium consists of 13 districts located in the southeast region of the state. Its activities are governed by a steering committee, which is comprised of teachers and administrators representing all participating schools. The Consortium conducted a one-year needs assessment to identify priority areas for in-service activities at the system, building, and individual levels. Identified training priorities include interpersonal communication, technology, and curriculum infusion. Consortium activities are funded through fees collected from participating districts (\$50,000), the state, McREL, and various federal sources (Goals 2000, Title I, School-to-Work, and Tech Prep).

Contacts/Information Resources

Marilyn Ridenhower
Executive Director
Education Standards and Practices Board
600 E. Boulevard
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440
701-328-2297

Clarence Bina
Director of Special Projects
Office of Instructional Support
Department of Public Instruction
600 E. Boulevard, 9th Floor
Bismarck, ND 58505-0440
701-328-2098

Helen Busche
Director of Professional Development
North Dakota Education Association
410 East Thayer Avenue
P.O. Box 5005
Bismarck, ND 58502-5005
701-223-0450

Reports and Publications

The Professional Development Guidelines: Effective Practices, Education Standards and Practices Board (September 1996).

Professional Development Model: A "Holistic" Approach, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (1985).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Ohio

Number of Teachers: 107,444

Average Years of Experience: 16

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 42%

Average Salary: \$35,912¹

Education Policy Context

Ohio's K-12 public education system serves over one million students annually. There were 611 districts and 3,684 schools in 1995-96.

The Ohio legislature has spearheaded the development of state standards for schools and school personnel and have promoted local decision making on how to meet these educational goals. The State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) has been restructured and its role reshaped from regulation and compliance to serving and supporting schools, specifically in school improvement efforts.

In 1992, Ohio government, business, and education leaders embarked on a year-long "gap analysis" process to identify needs in the current educational system. The gap analysis report, *Removing the Barriers*, led to the development of the Building Excellent Schools for Today & the 21st Century (BEST) initiative, which establishes strategies for improving education and focuses on high performance and high standards; accountability for results; parent, business, and community involvement; and equal access to quality education. The SEA, under the direction of the State

Board of Education (SBE), has been working with the Learner Outcomes Panel, a broad-based group representing educational stakeholders, to set a direction for Ohio's schools by developing new school standards.

The proposed school standards will focus the system of education on preparing all learners to be successful by defining core learner standards for Pre-K through the twelfth grade, with additional related standards for gifted, special needs, and vocational students. The standards also include chapters for chartered nonpublic, special purpose, and nonchartered, nontax-supported schools. The emphasis on accountability for results and increased student achievement is operationalized through performance standards for schools and districts. Progress toward meeting these standards will be reviewed annually to determine the state support and/or intervention necessary to ensure satisfactory progress. The state's Venture Capital program awards grants directly to schools that are prepared to undertake major school improvements. These grants can be used for professional development. These five-year grants have been awarded to over 500 schools. The State Superintendent also announced an Urban Schools Initiative in 1996. It is intended to assist the state's 20 urban districts.

The focus on school improvement is reinforced by having the bulk of professional development dollars flow directly to schools; by maintaining a major commitment of state funds to technology, particularly at the primary levels; and by consolidating programs, so that schools have the flexibility to meet state standards in ways they believe are most appropriate for their respective student populations.

The State Role in Professional Development

Ohio's reform agenda encompasses standards for teacher preparation, licensure, and professional development. In October of 1996, the SBE adopted new teacher education and licensure standards, which identify performance-based measures for ensuring that teachers are well-prepared and will continue to learn throughout their careers. Full implementation of the new standards will commence in the fall of 1998. The centerpiece of the standards is an entry-year program for beginning teachers, which includes mentoring and performance assessment components modeled after the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards. In addition, teacher preparation standards endorsed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Education (NCATE) will be used to review all Ohio teacher education programs. The new standards also outline requirements for continuous professional development that will be linked to licensure advancement and renewal (see below).

To complement the SBE's vision for teacher standards, the SEA merged its divisions for certification and professional development into one unit. Created in May of 1996, the Office of Teacher Education, Certification and Professional Development exemplifies this new approach to providing a seamless professional development system. In addition, Ohio is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. Upon completion of all preservice requirements, entry-level teachers receive a four-year Provisional Certificate, which is renewable with six semester hours or 18 continuing education units (CEUs). After three years of satisfactory teaching experience and the accrual of 30 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree, teachers may advance to an eight-year Professional Certificate. The Professional Certificate may be renewed with 12 semester hours or 36 CEUs. Teachers with master's degrees who have earned at least 12 semester hours since obtaining their Professional Certificates are granted permanent certification. Since 1996, Ohio has supported teachers seeking to obtain National Board Certification by providing state funds to pay for application fees and by recognizing, through grants, teachers who have achieved this professional license. Currently, Ohio has six National Board Certified teachers.

Under the newly adopted Teacher Education and Licensure Standards (which take effect in the fall of 1998), all beginning teachers will be required to participate in a first-year induction program and pass a performance assessment before they are granted the Professional License. Once obtained, renewal of the Professional License will

be required every eight years throughout a teacher's career. Renewal requirements may be fulfilled through a variety of activities, such as coursework, CEUs, and other professional activities as approved by a local professional development committee. In addition, teachers will now be required to earn master's degrees or complete 30 semester hours of graduate credit in classroom teaching and/or an area of licensure within ten years of obtaining their initial Professional Licenses. Once the new standards are enacted, permanent certificates will no longer be issued.

In preparation for the implementation of the new licensure standards, a series of pilot projects for the Beginning Teacher Residency Program have been implemented. The residency combines mentoring support, training in instructional theory, and the PRAXIS III: Classroom Performance Assessment. Beginning teachers are paired with non-evaluative mentor teachers in their buildings who teach the same subject. Mentor teachers spend two hours each week (both inside and outside the classroom) with beginning teachers, and university faculty conduct weekly sessions with them, engaging in reflective discussions focused on the 19 criteria used in the PRAXIS III. State-trained assessors, most of whom were classroom teachers themselves, conduct the assessment and determine advancement in licensure. Since 1994-95, nine Ohio universities and 46 school districts have participated, involving a total of 209 beginning teachers. Early evaluation results from the pilot found that beginning teachers and mentors acted as "co-learners" and that both perceived the PRAXIS III to be a valuable resource in developing a framework for instructional practice. A more formal, external evaluation is planned for 1997.

State-Supported Programs. In 1991, Ohio's General Assembly appropriated funds to establish eight centers for teacher training and development, known as Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). These Centers serve two major purposes. First, the RPDCs create and coordinate professional development opportunities in response to local needs; second, Center

staff assist districts with school improvement strategies. The Centers build collaboration among school districts, institutions of higher education, private providers, and others interested in teacher development and school improvement.

During the 1995-96 school year, Ohio expanded the number of RPDCs to 12 and realigned their regions. The new service areas are roughly continuous with Ohio's Economic Development Regions, which serve as the regional structure for many state programs, including School-to-Work and Tech Prep. An attempt has been made to determine the extent to which professional development needs are being met through the work of the RPDCs by categorizing the types of activities in which teachers engage and quantifying their involvement. Preliminary reports indicate that school improvement activities slightly outnumber curriculum activities, and each of these activities vastly outnumber technology training and workshops.

Additional state-supported professional development initiatives include Venture Capital grants to schools, SchoolNet Summer Institutes (Ohio's statewide technology program), and local professional development block grants. Other major areas of training and technical assistance by the state include school improvement strategies, other technology areas, and curriculum development, particularly as it relates to student standards.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Project Discovery—a collaborative project of higher education institutions, the SEA, and local districts—was Ohio's Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI), funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). This middle-school-level professional development project focused on strengthening teachers' knowledge and skills in inquiry and problem-solving strategies for math and science instruction. The delivery system was organized by regions to foster teacher and educator networking. Another component of this model was to build a critical mass of trained teachers in a school. Although NSF funding for Project Discovery expired in 1996, the

state continues to support this activity through the RPDCs. NSF funding continues in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus, where Urban Systemic Initiatives (USI) grants have been awarded.

Through Goals 2000, funding is available in Ohio for school districts wishing to establish local professional development committees before the mandated implementation in the fall of 1998, as authorized in the teacher licensure standards adopted by the SBE in October of 1996. Participating districts will be required to: (1) establish local professional development committees by the spring of 1997 and operate them throughout 1997-98; (2) operate under a waiver from the current certificate renewal procedures; and (3) meet quarterly with SEA staff to report on their progress and assist the SEA in the development of guidelines for the operation of local professional development committees. Grants of up to \$50,000 will be awarded on a competitive basis.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state allocates \$8 million annually in local professional development block grants. Each district receives a grant based on a per-pupil funding formula. From 1991 to 1997, the legislature has allocated \$23 million in state monies to support the RPDCs. Approximately 552 schools have been awarded five-year Venture Capital grants, which provide \$25,000 each year to promote staff capacity and create performance-driven learning environments. Since 1996, \$1.6 million in state funds has been appropriated to provide incentives for teachers who are pursuing National Board Certification.

Federal Funds. Ohio received \$3,715,308 in Goals 2000 funding in 1994, \$14,833,684 in 1995, and \$14,239,564 in 1996. Approximately \$1 million of Ohio's Goals 2000 funds will be used to support the piloted local professional development committees. Ohio also received \$8,711,522 in Eisenhower funds for professional development in 1995.

Local Funds. Districts rely heavily upon state-funded block grants and federal Eisenhower funds to support local professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Generally speaking, districts are not required to design or implement a formal professional development plan. If the draft standards for schools are adopted, such a requirement would be in place at the building level by the 1998-99 school year. The state requires a 180-day school year calendar, of which two days may be designated for in-service activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries are determined by a state salary scale, which may be supplemented through local bargaining agreements. Advancement on the salary scale is awarded based on years of experience, degrees earned, and continuing graduate credits. Tuition reimbursement policies are determined at the local level.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The University of Cincinnati (UC), in partnership with the Cincinnati Public Schools district, created the Cincinnati Initiative for Teacher Education (CITE) in 1987 for the purpose of improving teacher preparation. CITE established 13 Professional Practice Schools to provide classroom training experiences for UC education students. Lead teachers from the district are assigned to serve as mentors to UC education students during their required fifth-year placement at a Professional Practice School. The lead teachers and UC faculty work collaboratively to provide students with guidance and feedback. In turn, this

initiative also fosters professional relationships and dialogue between practicing teachers and education faculty regarding the issues of instruction and teacher quality.

The Ohio State University (OSU) College of Education, in cooperation with the Franklin County School Districts, began creating professional development school (PDS) sites during the 1991-92 school year. Modeled after the six principles issued by the Holmes Partnership (formerly known as the Holmes Group), PDS sites promote intellectual and resource exchange among school personnel, students of education, and college faculty. The OSU/Franklin County School Districts Professional Development School Policy Board sets operational criteria and governs the activities of PDS sites. OSU faculty serve as supervisors and work at school sites with experienced teachers who have been trained to serve in a "cooperating" role to evaluate and provide guidance to student interns placed at PDS sites. Participating districts and schools earn compensation points for implementing various PDS components; these points may be redeemed to cover the cost of enrollment in university courses for certified district employees. There are currently 12 PDS sites represented in this partnership.

Contacts/Information Resources

Nancy Eberhart
Director
Teacher Certification and Professional Development
Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-2761

Marilyn Troyer
Associate Director
Teacher Certification and Professional Development
Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614-644-0168

Sheryl Hansen
Director
Education Improvement and Innovation
Ohio Education Association
225 E. Broad St., Box 2550
Columbus, OH 43213
614-228-4526

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Oklahoma

Number of Teachers: 39,031**Average Years of Experience: 13****Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 40%****Average Salary: \$27,612¹**

Education Policy Context

Oklahoma Task Force 2000 was established in 1989 by then-Governor Henry Bellmon to develop a comprehensive education plan to enhance student learning, address school funding issues, and provide incentives for Oklahoma teachers. The Task Force's recommendations resulted in the Education Reform and Funding Act (HB 1017) of 1990, which consolidated rural districts, increased school aid funding for these districts, raised the minimum teacher salary schedule, established a state core curriculum and testing program, and mandated training for local school board members. This reform agenda required a substantial financial investment, and Oklahomans passed a tax referendum to fund it. State appropriations for public education have increased to \$1.4 billion annually—nearly double pre-reform era spending.

Standards-based learning is a major thrust of HB 1017. The Oklahoma Curriculum Committee outlined competencies and curricular standards in the document, *Learner Outcomes: Oklahoma State Competencies*, which was adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) in January of 1991. These learner outcomes became the basis for Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS), a core curriculum mandate that was implemented in 1993-94. The PASS curriculum

includes mathematics, science, social studies, language arts, languages, the arts, and the integration of technology education, instructional technology, health/safety and physical education, and information skills. The Oklahoma Core Curriculum Test is administered to students in grades 5, 8 and 11. Students are tested in mathematics, science, reading, and writing; other subject areas will be phased in by the spring of 2000. Test results are publicly reported and are used to drive instruction. Districts are required to provide full-year remediation and retest students who perform poorly.

HB 1017 also created new accreditation standards, which require districts to develop a four-year Comprehensive Local Education Plan (CLEP) focusing on school improvement, professional development, capital improvement, and alternative education. To support local school improvement efforts, the state has loosened regulations (through a deregulation process) and has established a popular alternative teacher certification program.

The State Role in Professional Development

Oklahoma does not have a state policy regarding standards for the professional development of public school educators. However, efforts in this regard have become the focus of work by the Oklahoma Commission on

Teacher Preparation (OCTP). The 20-member OCTP is composed of teachers, administrators, college faculty, and citizens who are appointed by the legislature and the governor. The OCTP was created by legislative statute in 1994 to develop a competency-based system of teacher preparation and testing. These responsibilities will be fully assumed by OCTP in July of 1997. The OCTP is organized into five committees: (1) assessment; (2) teacher education program approval and accreditation; (3) certification and licensure; (4) professional development; and (5) administrative operations. The OCTP has statutory authority to deliver professional development institutes (PDIs) which, by law, provide a minimum of 30 clock hours of competency-based training and require teachers to demonstrate competencies by developing a work product that can be used in the classroom. In December of 1994, the OCTP issued its "Report on Educator Preparation and Professional Development," which identified eight competency areas for professional development. The Teacher Preparation Act (HB 1549), passed in July of 1995, mandates that these competencies be disseminated by the Oklahoma Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to each school district. The state-funded professional development centers (PDCs) (see below) are directed to provide technical assistance in the implementa-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

tion of the competencies to local school districts. The OCTP is currently seeking funds to implement the PDIs.

In addition, Oklahoma is a partner state with the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and will undergo a teacher development policy audit, the results of which will be used to institute a comprehensive plan for teacher professional development.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Teacher Reform Act of 1980 (HB 1706) provides the foundation for existing teacher preparation and certification policies. Through HB 1706, Oklahoma became the first state in the nation to establish a support program for beginning teachers, the Entry-Year Assistance Program, which is now called the Residency Program. Under this program, all first-year teachers are issued a license and are required to participate in a one-year induction program. Districts are responsible for assigning each first-year teacher a residency committee, consisting of a mentor teacher (who has at least two years of teaching experience), a school administrator, and a faculty member from a college of education.

Three committee-resident teacher conferences are held each year. Committee members must observe and evaluate new teachers based on four performance dimensions: human relations, teaching and assessment, classroom management, and professionalism. The mentor teacher is paid a state-supplied stipend not to exceed \$500 and must engage in a minimum of 72 hours of consultation and observation. Mentors may not be assigned to more than one resident teacher during each school year. School administrators and college faculty members may serve simultaneously on several residency committees, however. Teachers who successfully complete the residency program at the end of one year are eligible to receive the Standard Certificate, which is renewable every five years, provided that the teacher has maintained active and satisfactory teaching employment. Teachers who, after a second residency year, are still not recommended for certification may no longer hold a teaching certificate in the state of Oklahoma. More than 24,000 first-year teachers have participated in

the residency program since its inception.

The residency program must be implemented in accordance with the guidelines and evaluation instruments issued by the SBE. Currently, committee members are not required to participate in any formal training. The OCTP plans to offer PDIs for mentor teacher training. All training will be research-based and will focus on best practices related to beginning teacher induction and mentoring.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA sponsors statewide institutes and regional workshops to assist teachers in upgrading their skills regarding the core curriculum. In-service activities focus on areas of need as determined by student performance on core curriculum tests. Statewide professional development is largely coordinated through a locally based network of PDCs.

Oklahoma's PDCs are an outgrowth of the Federal Teacher Center Act of 1976. The Centers became state-funded in 1981 and have grown in number from two to seven sites located regionally throughout the state. The PDCs are housed within selected districts and provide opportunities for all state educators to access information and resources that promote quality instruction in the classroom and overall school improvement. PDCs offer, on a non-fee basis, customized training and technical assistance in professional skills, instructional materials and equipment, information systems, and state and federal requirements. Each PDC is staffed by a full-time director and a secretary; they are managed under the jurisdiction of their host district. PDCs are required to submit an annual report to the SBE. Documentation maintained on PDC activities indicates that educators from every school district request and receive services through this initiative.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Under the 1980 Teacher Reform Act, the legislature appropriates funds directly to each district for the exclusive purpose of professional development. The appro-

priation is based on average daily attendance, and its 1995-96 rate of \$1.75 per pupil totaled close to \$1 million statewide. Each of the seven PDCs receives an average annual appropriation of \$99,000. The Residency Program is a \$1-million line-item expenditure in the state education budget.

Federal Funds. Many SEA-sponsored professional development activities are supplemented with federal funds provided by the Title II, Title IV, and Title VII programs. Oklahoma received a \$3-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant in 1995-96. Oklahoma rejected Goals 2000 funding.

Local Funds. Local funds for professional development beyond state-appropriated amounts are expended at districts' discretion. In-kind support (e.g., facility space and utilities) from PDC host districts is valued at \$350,000 per year.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The Comprehensive Local Education Plan (CLEP), required for school accreditation, includes a professional development component. Districts must establish a professional development committee consisting primarily of teachers and including administrators and parents. The committee is responsible for designing the professional development plan which must be approved by the SBE before the district can receive its state allocation for professional development. Mandated components of the plan include multicultural education, outreach to parents, and HIV/AIDS education and prevention. Other program components are based on locally determined needs.

Accreditation standards also require each certified teacher and administrator within the district to earn 75 professional development points every five years. One professional development point is awarded for each clock hour of in-service activity, and 15 points are awarded for every semester hour of college credit. Districts are responsible for awarding and tracking the number of professional development points earned.

By statute, districts may allocate up to five professional development days per year, which are funded by local budgets.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The state teacher salary schedule is based on a teacher's years of service and degrees earned. Many districts' bargaining agreements award step increases for additional graduate credits. State law allows teachers to request tuition reimbursement of up to 50 percent, but local funds are generally not available to honor such requests. Teacher mentors in the Residency Program receive a stipend that may not exceed \$500.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Oklahoma Education Association (OEA) offers an extensive professional development program that consists of workshops and conferences. The OEA has six regional offices; each has an Instructional Advocacy Specialist and 30 field staff members who are available to fulfill training requests from districts. OEA's annual convention is considered to be the largest professional development opportunity offered to teachers in the state. Each year, 8,000 to 12,000 teachers participate in this two-day event. Topics featured during the convention are determined by the needs identified by OEA members. Twelve subject-matter associations sponsor workshops that are offered at the convention. The *OEA Focus* newsletter, published eight times each year, provides information on OEA events and other teacher-related interests. In response to the OCTP's revision of teacher certification policies, OEA began publishing an occasional newsletter, entitled *OEA Issues*, which focuses on professional development and other critical issues.

The Northwest Oklahoma Cooperative for Inservice (NWOCI) was created in 1979. NWOCI is a cooperative of schools in the 14 counties that consti-

tute the rural northwestern region of the state. The Dean of Northwestern Oklahoma State University's School of Education serves as executive secretary and, together with the NWOCI Board of Directors, conducts an annual needs assessment of school personnel to help NWOCI identify and plan upcoming in-service topics. NWOCI contracts nationally prominent consultants and offers a variety of in-service workshops. Two delegates from each participating district comprise the NWOCI delegate assembly from which the Board of Directors is elected. The Board meets bi-monthly. Participating districts pay an annual membership fee assessed at \$.75 per average daily attendance, but not to exceed \$1,000.

The Southeastern Oklahoma Council for Public School Improvement (SOCPSI) is a partnership between the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences at Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SOSU) and the school districts in the 12-county region that SOSU serves. SOCPSI was formed in July of 1991 to increase the educational effectiveness of public schools in Southeastern Oklahoma and to enhance the University's involvement in K-12 public education. The goals of the partnership are to expose educators to national areas of instructional concern; facilitate problem-solving through networking and interchange; showcase Oklahoma's effective school plans by reporting on successful programs; and build linkages between districts' needs and the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences' programs. SOCPSI provides professional development opportunities, such as substitute teacher training, forums on critical issues pertaining to education, and workshops for public school guidance counselors. SOCPSI also sponsors two major presentations every year. Educational experts at the national, state, and regional levels have been featured at these events.

The Child Service Demonstration Center (CSDC) offers an array of services to Oklahoma schools, teachers, students, and other organizations concerned with the welfare of at-risk and learning-disabled youth. The CSDC provides direct services to schools in the

areas of professional development, adaptive interventions, consultation, and assistance in proposal writing. The CSDC has developed 27 workshop topics, as described in their *Professional Development Workshop Series* catalogue, which is mailed to every Oklahoma school district each spring. Priority for workshop development is based upon state mandates and requests by school districts and educational organizations. The CSDC also conducts made-to-order workshops, such as Grant Writing and Special Education Categories Overview, to meet special requests from school districts. In 1995-96, a total of 8,421 Oklahoma teachers representing 243 school districts and agencies attended CSDC-sponsored professional development activities.

Contacts/Information Resources

Ramona Paul
Assistant State Superintendent for Professional Services
Oklahoma State Department of Education
Hodge Education Building
2500 North Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
405-521-4311

Linda Ruhman
Director
Professional Development and Residency Program
Oklahoma State Department of Education
405-521-4527

Donna A. Payne
Executive Director
Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Preparation
3033 North Walnut, Suite 120-E
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
405-525-2612

Floyd Cox
Instructional Advocacy Specialist
Oklahoma Education Association
P.O. Box 18485
Oklahoma City, OK 73154
405-528-7785

Reports and Publications

Investing in Oklahoma: The Progress of Education Reform (Volume one). Oklahoma State Department of Education (April 1996).

"Report on Educator Preparation and Professional Development." Oklahoma Commission on Teacher Preparation (December 1994).

Oklahoma Professional Development Centers: Project Proposal for School Year 1995-96.

OEA Issues (a publication dealing with professional issues pertinent to public education). Oklahoma Education Association.

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Oregon

Number of Teachers: 26,488

Average Years of Experience: 15

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%

Average Salary: \$37,589

Education Policy Context

Oregon has embraced education reform, reshaping policies and practice through legislation. In 1984, the Essential Learning Skills and Common Curriculum Goals, which articulate basic skills expectations for local schools, were developed. The School Improvement and Professional Development Act of 1987 was enacted to develop lighthouse schools throughout the state, allowing schools to engage in innovation by creating their own solutions to educational problems. Almost half of the school districts in Oregon have participated in this program, which combines top-down and bottom-up support. In 1989, the Oregon legislature enacted the 21st Century Schools Program, permitting waivers of statutes, rules, and contracts that inhibit progress toward school improvement. Schools may restructure school operations and professional relationships as outlined in a school improvement plan that is developed by the local school council, reviewed by a state advisory committee, and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE).

In 1991, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century was passed. This statute greatly expands the use of waivers and provides a visionary framework for systemic school improvement. As part of this act, Oregon Benchmarks were developed, and state-level task

force groups worked to establish a 20-year strategic plan for the state's public education system. Task force recommendations addressed the following areas: certificates of initial mastery (CIM), certificates of advanced mastery (CAM), site-based decision making, non-graded primary education, middle-level education, alternative learning environments, school choice, the integration of social services, an extended school day and year, and employment opportunities for minors.

The Educational Act for the 21st Century also established the School Improvement and Professional Development Program, which encourages the following measures: (1) the development of educational goals for individual schools and districts; (2) the assessment of the educational progress of school programs and students; (3) the expansion of professional growth and career opportunities for Oregon teachers; (4) the restructuring of the school workplace to provide teachers with responsibilities and authority commensurate with their status as professionals; (5) the development and coordination of pilot programs to evaluate the viability of proposed rules, policies, or recommendations that affect professional practices associated with teaching methods, curricula, instructional materials, instructional format and organization, assessment, and related testing; and (6) the identification of validated educational

research used to substantiate the rationale for initiating pilot programs. In addition, the changes in classrooms resulting from the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century have systematically impacted the type of training required of classroom teachers, the programs through which they are prepared, and the requirements for credentialing.

The State Role in Professional Development

As part of the School Improvement and Professional Development Program, Oregon's overall vision for teacher professional development is currently being redefined. The Oregon Teachers Standards and Practices Commission, the Oregon State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA), public and private colleges and universities, and statewide professional organizations have been working together since 1991 to redesign Oregon's teaching, counseling, and administrator licensure system to align more closely with the developmental level of students. Tied directly to licensure, a key element of the redesign is professional development for both new teachers and Oregon's existing teaching workforce. Work is currently underway to define both the quantity of continuing education that will be required as well as those activities that will

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

qualify for continuing education credit. The specifics of the professional development plan, which requires both the legislature's and the Commission's approval, is scheduled for adoption in March of 1997.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Oregon Teachers Standards and Practices Commission was established by statute in 1965 to advise the SBE on certification, teacher and administrator preparation programs, and teacher job performance. In 1973, the legislature conferred complete and exclusive authority to the Standards and Practices Commission for teacher certification, teacher education programs, and the maintenance of professional standards. The Commission is entirely supported by fees and has made a number of policy changes affecting teacher preparation, among which are increased requirements for admission to teacher education programs through higher program standards; increased requirements for licensure through basic skills, subject-matter, and professional knowledge tests; requirements of pupil work samples during student teaching; requiring state and FBI fingerprint checks; and the development and field testing of a beginning-teacher assessment and professional development program.

Current licensure regulations stipulate that, upon completion of all preservice requirements, teachers are issued a Basic Teaching License that is valid for three years. The Standard License is valid for five years and is issued to teachers with three years of at least half-time teaching experience upon the completion of a master's degree or 45 quarter hours of upper-division or graduate coursework beyond the bachelor's. One-third of the credits must be in teacher education, with a focus on diagnostic, prescriptive, and evaluative techniques; research; guidance and counseling; and advanced instruction in reading appropriate to the candidate's endorsement, assignment, and previous preparation. Both basic and standard licenses are renewable with one full year (180 days) of satisfactory teacher experience during the life of the license, or with nine quarter hours of coursework—or a combination of both

(one quarter hour equals 20 days). Secondary level teachers may renew a basic license on a one-time basis, with 24 quarter hours of upper-division coursework toward a Standard Teaching License.

Legislation was passed in 1987 enacting the Oregon Beginning Teacher Support Program (BTSP). BTSP activities were piloted during the 1987-88 school year and funded statewide from 1991-93. Fiscal cutbacks in the SEA's budget have eliminated funds for this program.

The Standards and Practices Commission has proposed changes in licensure regulations to include an initial license, which would be held by a teacher for three years and renewable once, and a continuing license, which would be renewable every five years based on experience and continuing education. The Commission has proposed a professional development requirement that would be designed according to the instructional needs reflected in student achievement data.

State-Supported Programs. In 1994, the SEA implemented a regional strategy with the regional Educational Service Districts (ESDs) to help schools implement the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. Oregon's 36 counties are divided into nine regions, and a team of SEA staff is assigned to work with ESDs and local districts. These teams support school and district professional development needs by providing technical assistance and delivering training workshops, particularly for the Certificate of Initial Mastery Assessment, the Certificate of Advanced Mastery, curriculum frameworks, alternative learning environments, special needs students, and school improvement planning.

The SEA sponsored a summer institute in August of 1996, entitled "Teaching and Learning in a Standards-Based System." The four-day institute provided training in standards-based instruction. Workshop sessions were designed around content areas and introduced the concepts of authentic assessment design and application. Institute participants are now working at

the district level to orient and train their colleagues in standards-based curriculum development and instructional techniques. Over 200 teachers attended the first institute. The SEA has remained in contact with institute graduates, providing them with materials and assistance. Follow-up training has been proposed for the summer of 1997.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. In 1995-96, Oregon awarded 12 Goals 2000 subgrants to districts and ESDs. Over 50 percent of the schools in the state received Goals 2000 grants to implement school improvement strategies that help all students reach the standards incorporated in the state's Certificates of Initial Mastery and Advanced Mastery. Professional development is a key element in most of these grant activities.

In 1995, Oregon received \$1.2 million from the U.S. Department of Education as a three-year grant to develop standards for English, history, geography, civics, foreign languages, and the arts. Oregon formed a Content Standards Development Team to help produce the standards based on successful models. The project also includes designing and testing a model professional development program for teachers.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Oregon first began targeting funds for professional development in 1993. An initial allocation of \$6 million in grants-in-aid was awarded to schools on a competitive basis, and nearly half of all the schools in the state received funding. During the 1995-96 school year, \$1 million in funds was allocated to schools that had not received prior funding for school-based professional development. The ESDs received \$57.4 million from the state during the 1995-96 school year. However, most funding support for ESDs is generated by local property taxes.

Federal Funds. Oregon received Goals 2000 funds totaling \$1,046,640 in 1994, \$4,012,392 in 1995, and \$3,803,352 in 1996. The federal Eisenhower (Title

VI) grant, which totaled \$2,137,351 in 1995-96, also provides a major source of funding for professional development.

Local Funds. Districts are required to pay service fees for some ESD-sponsored professional development programs. Although local districts have historically funded professional development, very tight budgets have restricted the flow of monies that supported these activities. In 1991, school funding formulas changed, placing more of the financial burden on the state.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Oregon's 21st Century School Act, which established the School Improvement and Professional Development Program, clearly indicates the state's belief that professional development is an integral part of the school improvement process. This vision includes the stipulation that every school will have a 21st Century Schools Council responsible for the development of plans to improve the professional growth of school staff and the administration of grants-in-aid for the professional development of teachers and of classified district employees. Teacher representation is required on the Councils.

The SEA reviews school improvement and professional development plans and recommends their approval to the SBE. District improvement plans must include the district's short-term and long-term goals for staff development and must also include provisions for partnerships with business, labor, and other groups that will afford workplace-based professional development opportunities for educational staff.

A state provision allows districts to allocate up to 30 hours (or 5 days) of professional development per school year.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries and advancement options are determined locally. Professional development is a permissive area

for bargaining, and policies and practices vary from district to district. Compensation and/or reimbursement for professional development activities are offered to teachers in some cases.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

There are no professional development schools operating in the state of Oregon. Institutions of higher education support professional development through their course offerings. For the most part, professional development services are provided by ESDs, private consultants hired through the district, and the SEA.

Contacts/Information Resources

Dave Myton
Executive Director
Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission
255 Capitol Street NE, Suite 105
Salem, OR 97310
503-378-6813

Joanne Flint
Assistant Superintendent
Curriculum, Instruction & Field Services
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street NE
Salem, OR 97310
503-378-8004, ext. 259

Jim Carnes
Director
School Board Leadership and School Improvement
Oregon School Boards Association
P.O. Box 1068
Salem, OR 97308
503-588-2800

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Pennsylvania

Number of Teachers: 101,301
 Average Years of Experience: 18
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 46%
 Average Salary: \$42,411¹

Education Policy Context

Pennsylvania's public education policy is driven by local control.

However, state support for education represents 46 percent of the state's budget and 38 percent of total school district revenues. State aid is distributed using an equalization formula that takes the wealth and revenue-raising ability of districts into consideration. A lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the school finance law was filed in 1991 by a group of rural and urban districts. In response to this case (which is still pending), Governor Tom Ridge created an Advisory Commission on Public School Finance in October of 1995 to review finance policies and provide recommendations for improvement. The nine-member Commission reviewed court case documents, as well as state and national reports, and held public hearings. In May of 1996, the Commission released its final report, which emphasized that equity in school finance should be a function of instructional program quality, not actual dollar allocations.

The Commission recommends the establishment of a core curriculum that identifies the components of a "thorough and efficient" education system, which the state is constitutionally charged to provide. Once established, state aid would be distributed using a foundation funding formula that ensures

each district the level of funding necessary to implement the core program. The report further states that academic standards must be developed and linked to an assessment system that will "measure whether the students of Pennsylvania are provided access to a quality core educational program." A high-stakes accountability system that would reward or sanction districts based on student performance is also proposed for consideration in the report. The Pennsylvania Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is currently developing a program of academic standards. A legislative mandate (SB 1352) calls for the creation of an Education Standards Commission to oversee public hearings on the standards and issue final recommendations to the Pennsylvania State Board of Education (SBE) and the legislature by November of 1996.

The State Role in Professional Development

The SEA issued professional development standards in 1989. The standards are used to approve the professional development plans that are required of all districts. Only SEA-approved activities can be used to satisfy the continuing professional development requirements that are linked to teacher certification.

Most policies affecting teacher professional growth are embedded in the SBE Chapter 49 regulations regarding the certification of professional personnel, which set forth all requirements pertaining to teacher licensure. These regulations undergo extensive review every ten years, and the most recent round occurred in 1995. In issuing its charge to the Chapter 49 review committee, the SBE stated, "What matters most now is what teachers know and can do, not how much time they spend in preparation or how many courses they complete." Proposed Chapter 49 revisions focus heavily on professional development (see the box on page 2). The SBE granted preliminary approval of the revisions in July of 1996.

Teacher Certification Policies.

Pennsylvania has used a two-tier system of teacher certification for many years. Upon successful completion of all preservice requirements (including an approved preparation program and the passing of four tests), teacher candidates are issued a six-year Instructional I Certificate. Since 1987, Instructional I-certified teachers have been required to participate in a locally designed and funded induction program. SEA guidelines require that induction programs: (1) be related to the district's strategic plan for learner outcomes; (2) be based on teachers' needs as identified through an ongoing assessment process; (3) provide new teachers with a mentor support

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Pennsylvania Professional Development (PD) Standards

- PD must have significant intellectual and practical content, the primary objective of which is to improve the participants' professional competence.
- PD must deal with matters directly related to subjects which satisfy the purposes of the professional development plan.
- PD must be organized and led by persons qualified with the practical or academic experience necessary to conduct the activity or experience effectively.
- PD must be approved as professional activities and experience by the continuing professional development committee of the school entity.

team; and (4) include a program evaluation component. The minimum length of the induction program is one year; local systems have the option of designing programs of longer duration. The goal of the induction program is to provide support for beginning teachers, and it is not intended for evaluative use. Instructional Level I teachers must also participate in continuing professional development activities as provided by the district.

An Instructional II Certificate is issued to teachers who have completed an SEA-approved induction program, can demonstrate three years of teaching experience, and have accrued 24 credit hours of post-baccalaureate or state-approved, in-service study. The Instructional II Certificate is sometimes called a permanent certificate; there are no recertification requirements assigned to Instructional II level teachers at this time. However, recently proposed legislative initiatives (SB 1410) would modify Chapter 49 and require Instructional II personnel to complete nine college credits and 270 clock hours of district-approved, in-service activities (or a combination of both). Master's level teachers' renewal requirements would be six college credits or 180 clock hours. Certificate renewal would be required every five years. Proposed Chapter 49 revisions also include a provision that would grant National Board Certified teachers automatic Level II certification status.

Teaching certificates are issued by the Bureau of Teacher Preparation and Certification, an operating unit of the

SEA Office of Higher Education. The Bureau also conducts the teacher education program approval process and monitors local staffing practices to ensure that they do not violate the *School Code*. The Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission is responsible for designing the state code for professional conduct and adjudication for disciplinary cases related to teacher certification. The Commission plays an advisory role to the SBE on matters affecting policies for teacher certification and teacher preparation program approval. Its membership is comprised of seven classroom teachers, three administrators, a teacher education program representative, and two community residents.

State-Supported Programs. Pennsylvania has 18 intermediate units (IUs) which provide professional development and other technical assistance services to districts located in their respective service areas. Rendering professional development for teachers through the IUs reflects the state's current teacher professional development delivery model. However, the Pennsylvania Teacher Leadership Initiative (eliminated in the fall of 1996 as part of budget cutbacks) was considered by many to be a successful and more comprehensive approach to promoting teacher professional growth.

Created in 1988, the philosophy of the Teacher Leadership Initiative was to support "teachers who, while maintaining their role as classroom teachers, are selected and choose to accept additional responsibility for assisting other teach-

ers, either individually or in teams, to improve their professional effectiveness." To this end, the SEA established nine Teacher Leadership Centers (TLCs) across the state to implement professional development programs that promote teacher leadership. Each TLC was governed by a local board, which was composed of a majority of classroom teachers and included administrators and university/college professors. Governing boards were responsible for developing the TLC's mission, setting annual objectives, and managing fiscal matters. Housed in a variety of settings (i.e., school districts, intermediate units, consortia, and universities), TLCs were staffed by a director and often contracted out for services. While each TLC program was customized to meet the needs of districts in their region, a State Advisory Board guided their work, and an SEA coordinator worked with directors to help integrate training on statewide reforms in curriculum and assessment and to develop an overriding mission and goals statement.

The TLCs sponsored an annual statewide Teacher Leadership Conference, which attracted approximately 300 teachers. The Centers also published *The Pennsylvania Journal of Teacher Leadership*, which featured articles written by teachers, and distributed it to every school in the state. Teacher Leadership Initiative activities were funded by a state appropriation. Over 15,000 Pennsylvania teachers were trained annually for Teacher Leadership roles during the seven years that this initiative was active.

Governor Ridge has introduced an educational technology initiative entitled "Project Link to Learn." The three-year, \$121-million initiative is intended to advance instructional technology in the classroom and create the Pennsylvania Education Network (PEN), a comprehensive telecommunications system linking school districts and public higher education institutions. In the first year of this initiative, activities will focus on computer equipment purchases, upgrades, and teacher training on the integration of technology into course curricula instruction.

The SEA administers an on-demand writing assessment to sixth and ninth graders. The primary objectives of the Pennsylvania Writing Assessment are to present a curriculum overview based upon student writing performance and to encourage teachers to incorporate the techniques of writing assessment (discovery drafting, revision, editing, and publishing) into their regular classroom instruction. A state advisory board comprised of teachers, administrators, and higher education representatives helped to develop this assessment and continue to guide its refinement. Since 1991, thousands of teachers have been trained as scorers, a function that provides them with staff development.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Pennsylvania distributes its Goals 2000 funding through subgrants that are awarded to districts, intermediate units, and vocational/technical schools. During the 1995-96 school year, 57 Goals 2000 subgrant recipients reported that a portion of their funds were used for professional development.

The School District of Philadelphia is working in partnership with the Children Achieving Challenge to implement standards-based reform and systemic restructuring. Created in 1995, this partnership is supported through a grant from the Annenberg Foundation and matching support from other public and private funders, totaling \$150 million over five years.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not provide categorical funding for professional development. State funds to support the IUs total \$5.5 million per year. Project Link funds are awarded through competitive grants and average \$16 per student. The Teacher Leadership Initiative received \$1.4 million annually; funding support for this initiative was eliminated as of the 1996-97 school year.

Federal Funds. Pennsylvania received a \$10.6-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant for the 1995-96 school year. Officials report that federal funds obtained through sources such as Title I and Special Education provide the bulk of resource support for district-level professional development activities.

Local Funds. Districts are required to implement a professional development and teacher induction plan. However, no state funds are allocated to support these activities. As a result, the quality and quantity of district professional development activities are a function of the resources available within local budgets.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Act 178, passed in 1982, represents Pennsylvania's primary mandate in the area of professional development. Act 178 requires each district to establish a "continuing professional development planning committee" composed of administrators and teachers to design a professional development plan that is updated and submitted every two years to the SEA's Division of School Based Improvement for approval. SEA guidelines stipulate that district professional development plans be designed to address needs at the district, school, and individual levels. Plans must describe the types of professional development activities to be conducted, which may cover a range of activities, including graduate-level coursework, SEA-ap-

proved in-service activities, curriculum development work, peer observations, and professional conferences or workshops. The professional development plan mandate has been in effect statewide since the 1988-89 school year.

In addition to the professional development plan, districts must also design and implement an induction plan and a strategic plan. Chapter 49 revisions, preliminarily approved in July of 1996, stipulate that parents and community representatives should have input in developing these plans and that the various planning processes should be coordinated and be complementary in focus.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher salaries are determined through local bargaining agreements. Most districts provide step increases for degrees earned. Some districts allow movement on the salary scale for teachers who obtain a "master's equivalency," which represents an accumulation of approved in-service credit that is rewarded with the same increase awarded for a master's degree. One in-service credit (for every 15 hours of in-service) is equivalent to one semester hour. Professional development issues (e.g., tuition reimbursement and in-service days) are negotiated through teachers' contracts.

Until recently, state law allowed any public school employee, after ten years of service, to take "sabbatical leave" (at 50 percent of their salary rate) for the purposes of health, education, or travel. Since the 1940s, teachers have used education and travel sabbaticals for the purpose of pursuing professional growth experiences. Education sabbaticals are granted for participation in a structured course of study. Travel sabbaticals may (at the discretion of local boards) require an approval process that includes submission of travel itinerary, description of educational benefit to students, and, upon return, follow-up reports and lesson plan materials. It is estimated that 5,000 teachers take sabbatical leave for education and travel purposes each year.

Estimates of the annual cost of the sabbatical leave program have made it a hotly debated topic. The sabbatical leave law was amended by the Senate in June of 1996 (Act 66-1996). Sabbaticals for health restoration continue to be an entitled mandate; sabbaticals for study were replaced with leaves of absence for professional development (subject to district approval) and require minimum graduate and/or undergraduate credits and/or hours of "professional development activities." The act eliminates travel sabbaticals.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA) offers an extensive array of professional development opportunities. PSEA hosts an annual, three-day Education Conference that is attended by over 500 teachers. As a precursor to their biannual delegate assembly meeting, PSEA brings 200 to 500 teachers together to participate in a series of 90-minute sessions on "critical issues" that provide awareness of key reforms affecting instructional practice in Pennsylvania and nationwide. The PSEA began developing cadres of trained teachers in 1991 to serve as trainers within Pennsylvania on issues pertaining to alternative assessment, strategic planning, inclusion, and other areas. Seventy-five teachers participate as presenters. The PSEA also sponsors a Summer Leadership Conference with a Professional Issues School (a four-day workshop) and offers numerous courses in conjunction with local colleges and universities.

Contacts/Information Resources

Frederica F. Haas
Director
Bureau of Teacher Preparation and Certification
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-772-4737

Timothy H. Daniels
Executive Policy Specialist
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-783-9781

Susan Spadafore
School Improvement Leadership Specialist
Pennsylvania Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-783-1830

Cordell Affeldt
Director of Professional Programs
Pennsylvania State Education Association
400 North Third Street
P.O. Box 1724
Harrisburg, PA 17105-1724
717-255-7028

Publications and Reports

Induction and Professional Development Guidelines. Pennsylvania Department of Education (May 1993).

The Pennsylvania Lead Teacher Program: 1992-93 Final Evaluation Report. Written by Marina Avi Piscolith for the Pennsylvania Department of Education (October 1993).

The Profession of Teaching in Pennsylvania: A Report on Lead Teachers. Written by The Academy for Educational Development for the Pennsylvania Department of Education (May 1989).

"Testimony before the Basic Education Subcommittee of the House Education Committee: Sabbatical Leaves." Submitted by David J. Gondak, President Pennsylvania State Education Association (December 5, 1995).

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.



Rhode Island

Number of Teachers: 9,823

Average Years of Experience: 17

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 53%

Average Salary: \$39,261¹

Education Policy Context

Rhode Island's 37 school districts serve approximately 142,150 children. Rhode Island has a long-standing tradition of local control over education. School districts are governed by locally elected school committees that determine school policies and procedures. However, recent court cases have highlighted the state's fundamental responsibility for education.

The strategic reform agenda of the Rhode Island Board of Regents (the governing policy board for the Rhode Island Department of Education) is focused on: high standards and achievement for all students; high-quality measurement of student performance; school improvement through accountability and professional development; integrated social services; and the equitable distribution of funding. This reform was affirmed and enhanced in the recently completed Rhode Island Goals 2000 Comprehensive Education Strategy, which adds approaches to improve teaching and learning for all students, and to create responsive and supportive systems.

The State Role in Professional Development

In 1993, the Commissioner of Education established a Professional Development

Policy Consortium, consisting of representatives from the state chapters of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association, the University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island College, the state Superintendents Association, and staff from the Rhode Island Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). The Consortium examines teacher certification and professional development issues. The Consortium's mission statement outlines its priorities as follows:

To develop an outcome-based system of professional preparation, certification, and life-long professional development which focuses on the knowledge, dispositions, and performances required of all educators to ensure an education of the highest quality and the achievement of learning outcomes for all our children.

The Consortium has concentrated on developing a standards-based approach to teacher certification and recertification, within a broader context of systemic change and accountability. It charged a working group, consisting of representatives from its member organizations, which is drafting new standards for beginning teachers. The working group is incorporating the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and

Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for educators, and has started piloting some standards for beginning administrators and teachers in three school sites. The sites have designated teams of administrators and teachers who will apply the INTASC standards and subsequently report to the state what they believe beginning teachers and administrators should be able to do. However, there has been no agreement at the Consortium level regarding standards-based recertification, even though the Board of Regents eliminated life certification as of May of 1997, and called for a system of standards-based, performance-related recertification.

The Consortium has outlined its guiding principles for teacher certification, preparation, and professional development as follows:

- reflective of valid research, a broad knowledge base, and best practice;
- based on standards of what educators should know and be able to do;
- responsive to the needs of teachers, administrators, schools, families, and communities;
- linked to the needs of schools and school improvement efforts;
- rigorous;

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

- acknowledging of various types and levels of life experience;
- interconnected to and supportive of one another;
- reflective of systemic change; and
- concerned with preparing teachers to work in a diverse society and to respond to students' diverse backgrounds.

The Collaborative's guiding principles specifically for teacher professional development are: it should be collaborative within schools, across schools and with higher education; it should be a life-long responsibility of all educators; and it should be based on shared responsibility and decision-making.

Teacher Certification Policies. After teachers are initially certified, they receive a provisional three-year certificate, during which they must accrue six college credits. After meeting this requirement, teachers receive a five-year professional certificate. Within five years, they must take nine credits, three of which can be in-service activities or continuing education unit (CEU) credits. If they obtain a master's degree in their teaching field and have six years of teaching experience, they receive a life certificate. However, the Board of Regents adopted an educational policy resolution in March of 1996 ending the issuance of life certificates by May of 1997.

The state is developing a performance-based teacher preparation program leading to initial certification, but assessments based on the new standards must be developed before determining their implication for practicing teachers. The Rhode Island Beginning Teacher Standards will reflect what every teacher should know and be able to do. Decisions regarding monitoring, evaluation and the continued employment of teachers are made locally based on collective bargaining.

The standard-setting activities of the Professional Development Policy Consortium are likely to influence the way recertification is handled in Rhode

Island. State teacher unions, for example, are already advocating language in local contracts regarding National Board Certification. The SEA is in agreement that Board Certification should constitute a comparable professional certificate.

The second round of Goals 2000 funding, awarded in January of 1996, set aside funds for the state's mentoring program for new teachers. The program offers financial support to districts to provide a veteran teacher mentor for beginning teachers. Each district received approximately \$10,000. The SEA, the two state teacher associations, and institutions of higher education developed the Request for Proposals and the training plan of Mentor Resource Consultants for the pilot sites. Representatives of the pilot districts meet periodically to share their progress, and hope to develop a statewide mentor network.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA Office of Teacher Education and Certification has a staff position dedicated to teacher professional development. Closer links between school improvement and professional development will be sought as the state implements initiatives related to its overall reform goals. Professional development guidelines, initially developed through a National Governors' Association grant, have been revised and shared with local school districts.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Projects. Schools applying for the Rhode Island Goals 2000 Project funds must detail their plans for teacher professional development as a part of their larger School Improvement Plans. Participating schools are also required to form partnerships with institutions of higher education to assist in the development and implementation of their School Improvement Plans.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. No state funds are allocated for teacher professional development in Rhode Island. Most funding that flows through the state for local professional development is Goals 2000 money, which is distributed through a

competitive grant process. The state does offer workshops, typically supported by a combination of federal and state money, in priority areas such as frameworks and performance assessments.

Federal Funds. In FY 1995, Rhode Island received \$1,243,473 in federal Eisenhower funding. The Goals 2000 initiative has provided resources to support districts and schools as they implement reform activities. In year one (1994-95), 26 projects were funded for a total of \$473,072; Goals 2000 funding provided \$210,999; state funds provided \$238,573; and federal Chapter I funds provided \$23,500. In year two (1995-96), 35 districts, schools, and educational collaboratives received awards totaling \$1,554,696. Goals 2000 funding provided \$1,254,696; the Rhode Island Foundation provided \$100,000; and the Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council provided \$200,000.

Local Funds. Some districts provide local dollars to support professional development, but the support is generally quite limited. Local dollars expended on teacher professional development seem to be the first eliminated in times of budget constraints.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

There are no state mandates of school districts regarding teacher professional development other than the school-based teacher professional development plans required by Goals 2000 contracts.

The state does not mandate a minimum number of days set aside for local professional development. Rhode Island has a 180-day instructional year, which includes two days that districts can petition the state to use for professional development. The Commissioner would like to require that all 180 days be used for instructional purposes and add five days to the school calendar for professional development, but this would necessitate additional state funds to extend the school year. The state does not mandate any local budget allocation for professional development.

The primary providers of professional development services for Rhode Island's teachers are the state's institutions of higher learning, the Annenberg Institute, private consultants, SEA personnel, and fellow practitioners. The state is encouraging districts to implement school-based management, including decisions about professional development. Professional development providers vary by school and, in the case of the Goals 2000 districts, are chosen according to the needs specified in School Improvement Plans.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Collective bargaining for professional development is not permitted at the state level. Teachers negotiate on a district-by-district basis for salary increments awarded for professional development activities and for other provisions, such as stipends. They bargain for inservice days beyond the 180 instructional days dictated by state law. The state previously allowed five of the 180 days for professional development but this has been discontinued.

Teachers are not currently awarded salary increments for National Board Certification, but the state's teachers' organizations are seeking language in local contracts that would provide increased compensation for teachers who receive Board Certification. Most teachers are not reimbursed for the costs associated with professional development activities. Contract negotiations focus primarily on salary increments.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

Both the Rhode Island Teachers Association and the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers (RIFT) hold conferences and workshops for their members. The two groups actively represent teachers' interests on professional development to the Board of Regents and other state agencies. RIFT is involved in the AFT Educational Research and Dissemination project: one

component of which provides practitioners with current research on math teaching; another component focuses on training local practitioners, particularly new teachers, in effective classroom techniques; and another helps teachers to communicate and increase parent and family involvement.

The Rhode Island Mathematics and Science Coalition works with corporations, such as AT&T and Bell Labs, to provide summer internships through the Teacher and Industry program. Teachers have the opportunity to work in industry and learn how what they teach applies to the workplace.

Rhode Island institutions of higher education are apparently the state's largest providers of teacher professional development and technical assistance. The Goals 2000 initiative requires districts to form partnerships with institutions of higher education to address their School Improvement Plans. Fourteen districts received grants from the state for professional development strategic planning; all of these districts are working with Professional Development Schools. There are three university-sponsored professional development schools in the state. The University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College maintain partnerships with local school districts. The Geography Alliance is a higher education initiative working with classroom teachers. Five regional collaboratives, each working with up to eight school districts, provide conferences or workshops in conjunction with an area institution of higher education. The capacity of the five collaboratives, however, varies greatly.

The state School-to-Work Committee has held conferences for teachers regarding school-to-work transition. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Working Wonders Network work with teachers. The Critical Friends Group, which emerged from the Coalition for Essential Schools Initiative, provides a practitioner-to-practitioner support group. The Institute for Labor Studies and Research is a private group focused on workplace literacy that runs programs in local high schools and provides teacher workshops.

Contacts/Information Resources

Susan Lima
Professional Development Specialist
Rhode Island Department of Education
22 Hayes Street
Providence, RI 02908
401-277-2046

Gloria Howard
Assistant Treasurer
Rhode Island Teachers Association
15C Olney Street
Providence, RI 02906
401-463-9630

Colleen Milecki
Director of Professional Issues
Rhode Island Federation of Teachers
356 Smith Street
Providence, RI 02908
401-273-9800

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

South Carolina

Number of Teachers: 38,620

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 43%

Average Salary: \$29,414¹

Education Policy Context

South Carolina's public K-12 system is comprised of 1,106 schools, which serve an ever-increasing population of more than 600,000 students. Early education reform efforts, initiated during the 1970s and 1980s, were highly regulatory in nature, giving the South Carolina Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) central authority over instructional activities at the local level. At the height of this era, the Education Improvement Act (EIA) of 1984 was considered to be the most comprehensive education package ever enacted in the state. This legislation sought to increase student achievement by emphasizing basic skills, state-supported remedial and compensatory education, preschool and kindergarten programs, and other elements to improve equity and address the fundamental problems of predominantly minority and poor school districts. EIA also was instrumental in promoting linkages between professional growth opportunities and school reform, providing more than \$1 million to support professional development.

The 1990 elections brought changes to South Carolina's political landscape, creating an infusion of new leadership and direction from the Governor's

House, the General Assembly, and the State Superintendent's Office. The state's new wave of education reform emphasizes "total quality education," which is the underlying premise of the 1993 Early Childhood and Academic Assistance Act 135. Act 135 promotes decentralization, school-based goal setting, and professional preparation and development. Each district and school is required to develop a long-range strategic plan for improvement that includes a professional development component to assist staff in meeting identified goals. The SEA has refocused its service mission from that of regulator to one of resource provider, while districts and schools have assumed greater responsibility for control and decision making regarding their educational programs.

The State Board of Education (SBE) began working to establish curriculum frameworks in 1992, which were formally adopted in 1993 for the areas of mathematics, performing and visual arts, and foreign languages. Framework development involved SEA staff, teachers, administrators, political and business leaders, parents, and other community members. The frameworks serve as a guide for state policy, program and resource allocation, professional development, school organization, and student assessment.

The State Role in Professional Development

In 1993, the SEA operationalized a vision for professional growth through the Assisting, Developing and Evaluation of Professional Teaching (ADEPT) program. The goal of ADEPT is to improve student learning by ensuring that teachers are knowledgeable, highly skilled, and committed to continuous professional growth. ADEPT measures teaching skills in ten performance dimensions: (1) long-range planning; (2) short-range instructional planning; (3) use of assessments; (4) establishing high expectations for all students; (5) using instructional strategies; (6) providing content; (7) monitoring and enhancing learning; (8) maintaining an environment for learning; (9) managing the classroom; and (10) fulfilling professional responsibilities outside the classroom. The performance dimensions are designed to reflect South Carolina's curriculum frameworks as well as the teaching standards identified by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

ADEPT provides the framework for teacher education program approval, teacher evaluations, and ongoing professional development activities. Since

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

the fall of 1993, ADEPT has been piloted in 16 districts, and statewide implementation is expected by the 1997-98 school year.

Teacher Certification Policies. Currently, first-year teachers are issued a one-year provisional contract. In 1993, the SEA pilot tested beginning teacher induction programs to encourage district-level activity in this area. The SEA developed guidelines recommending that, during their provisional year, new teachers should participate in an orientation program and receive mentoring and coaching support at the building level. Specific designs and implementation strategies for induction programs are determined at the local level. Upon completing one full year of teaching, a teacher is eligible to receive a standard certificate that is renewable every five years. There are different levels of the standard certificate, depending on the highest degree earned by a teacher. Requirements for renewal at each level are the same; a teacher must complete 6 semester hours of college course credit every five years. A portion of teachers' study (one-half) must be related to their content areas.

Once ADEPT is implemented statewide in the fall of 1997, revised teacher certification policies will be in effect. Under the new policy, second-year teachers will be issued an annual contract for up to two years. During this time, annual contract teachers must pass an ADEPT performance evaluation before advancing to continuing contract status. Unlike the former teacher evaluation process, ADEPT's evaluation embodies more than classroom observations. The evaluation includes data collected throughout the year on lesson plans and student work to capture the overall quality of teacher performance. Such performance-based models of evaluation help to promote ongoing professional development for continuing contract teachers. School principals receive SEA-sponsored evaluator training in the ADEPT model. Teachers who fail the evaluation after their third year are not eligible to teach in South Carolina for a minimum of two years, after which they may re-enter the system at the provisional contract level.

Those who pass receive a continuing contract license.

The continuing contract is a five-year, renewable license. Continuing contract teachers are required to participate in ADEPT through either a formative or summative evaluation process. Districts may elect to use one or both methods of evaluation. The summative evaluation consists of the same procedures used to evaluate annual contract teachers (i.e., classroom observations and collection of student work). Under the formative evaluation process, teachers must identify a minimum of three goals for professional growth and development in following areas: teaching content/subject matter, instructional strategies or assessment, and extracurricular or professional service. Districts are responsible for determining success criteria and monitoring procedures for the formative evaluation. Continuing contract teachers must participate in an ADEPT evaluation at least once every three years; however, performance results will not affect their contract status.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA Office of Professional Development serves to improve student learning by: aligning professional development with research and standards, providing efficient services to schools and districts, evaluating professional development activities, and providing data-driven professional development. The office was reorganized in 1995 into two sections, which are staffed by "education associates" who are assigned to one of six district/school clusters located across the state.

The Schools and District Assistance/Brokering section operates as a "broker" of resources and is able to respond to site-specific needs for services and information as requested. This section is responsible for approving and coordinating all training activities conducted by the SEA and for evaluating their effectiveness. All proposed SEA-sponsored professional development must meet the following guidelines (modeled after the National Staff Development Council standards) in order to be approved for implementation. These guidelines stipulate that professional development training:

- is based upon an assessment of participant needs;
- is consistent with organizational long-range plans;
- takes into account the climate necessary for the change process to occur, including the initiation, implementation, and institutionalization phases;
- establishes a rationale based upon current research and best practice;
- emphasizes active participant involvement in the learning process and utilizes a variety of instructional approaches;
- includes exhibitions (demonstrations) of the skills;
- provides adequate practice to refine the skills;
- employs a feedback mechanism for individual participants;
- provides adequate follow-up activities to ensure skill development;
- includes evaluation procedures which assess long-term professional growth; and,
- promotes and applies team skills in planning and implementing professional development activities.

The SEA's Leadership Academy section provides training seminars throughout the year that are attended by school-based teams. The Academy offers Professional Development Institutes to assist participants in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and techniques that are necessary to successfully implement major education initiatives operating in the state. Each year, several institutes are offered, consisting of a series of seminars scheduled over the course of the school year. The Academy seminars focus on leadership development in the areas of oral communication, management skills, instructional leadership skills, and school improvement.

SEA staff determine institute topics based on an annual statewide needs assessment and a review of professional development interests, as identified in district-level strategic plans. Participation in SEA-sponsored professional development activities is optional; however, teachers interested in becoming certified in technology preparation must attend state-sponsored workshops in this area. Institute activities are offered free of charge.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Since 1993, the SEA has managed South Carolina's Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI) under the governance of the Governor's Mathematics and Sciences Advisory Board. SSI activities are operationalized through 13 regional mathematics and science hubs located throughout the state. Each hub consists of a network of school representatives, higher education institutions, local businesses, and other community members. Hubs operate under the direction of a regional advisory committee and exist to provide districts and schools with professional development and other services to improve math and science instruction in alignment with the state curriculum frameworks.

The South Carolina Education Goals 2000 Panel has identified "teacher education and professional development" as one of its top five education improvement priorities. For the 1995-96 year, 32 districts have received Goals 2000 grants to implement professional development as outlined in their local strategic plans.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Since 1984, the EIA has provided over \$3.1 million annually to support teacher professional development, and, despite recent budget cuts in this area, state support remains strong. Districts receive flow-through funds for professional development based on student enrollment and average daily attendance. Two major teacher development initiatives, the Commission on Higher Education's Centers of Excel-

lence and the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching, are supported through EIA. The ADEPT program received \$250,000 for 1994-95 pilot activities; however, additional funds will be needed to support expanded implementation over the next two years.

Federal Funds. Approximately \$96,000 of the state's Goals 2000 funds have been allocated for professional development activities at the local level. South Carolina received a \$3.3-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant for the 1995-96 school year. The state's SSI activities are supported through a five-year, \$9.6-million grant from the National Science Foundation.

Local Funds. The EIA requires districts to allocate \$10 per certified FTE for professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Since 1984, districts have been required to submit a five-year strategic plan that is updated annually. Act 135 strengthened this process by mandating the creation of school improvement councils to ensure building-level alignment with district goals. Act 135 also identified staff development as a required component of the strategic plan. The law states that each district "must provide staff development to prepare and train teachers and administrators in the teaching techniques and strategies to implement their District Strategic Plans." Ten days are incorporated in the school year calendar for professional development, five at the district level and five at the school level.

District plans are submitted to and monitored by the state. School-level renewal plans are also developed but are not state-monitored. Each district designates a staff development coordinator, who participates in SEA-sponsored training or meetings and is responsible for the coordination and assessment of district-level training activities. SEA staff are available to assist and provide resources to districts upon request.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

South Carolina is a right-to-work state, making collective bargaining illegal. Teachers' salaries are based on the state's minimum salary schedule, which provides step increases for additional college credits or degrees earned and for the number of years of teaching. Salary increments are awarded at the rate of \$200 per year during each of the first 17 years of teaching service. This increment is decreased to \$100 for 18 to 25 years of service, and no annual increase is awarded to teachers with beyond 25 years of service. Teachers may receive stipends, paid for by SEA or district funds, for participation in summer staff development activities. Original EIA legislation provided tuition reimbursement for college courses successfully completed, with a limit of one course every two years. However, this appropriation was rescinded during the 1995 legislative session as part of the reductions made in the EIA budget.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The South Carolina Education Association (SCEA) sponsors a two-day state convention each March. The 1995 convention, attended by approximately 1,000 teachers, offered 33 workshops covering 15 to 20 different topic areas. The SCEA is currently designing regional workshops that will be implemented for the first time during the 1996-97 school year. The purpose of the regional workshops are to make SCEA-sponsored training events more accessible to members who are unable to attend the annual convention and to customize training topics to match local needs and interests. SCEA leaders are hoping to form partnerships with districts in this effort and to utilize local in-service days to promote greater teacher participation.

The EIA funds dispersed to the Commission on Higher Education support the Centers of Excellence initiative, which began with one site in 1987 and

currently involves eight centers located at six higher education institutions. The centers serve as "state-of-the-art" resource teacher preparation programs that develop model programs, conduct research, disseminate information, and provide training for K-12 and higher education personnel. Any South Carolina public or private college that is authorized by the SBE to offer teacher education programs is eligible to apply to host a center. Upon approval from the Commission, a center is funded for two years, contingent on the availability of funds, with the expectation of renewal for a second two-year cycle. The University of South Carolina houses three centers: Assessment of Student Learning, Middle Level Initiatives, and Special Education Technology. Clemson University has centers in Mathematics and Science Education and Rural Special Education. Each of the following sites operate one center: Furman University houses a Foreign Language Instruction center, Coastal Carolina University has an English Composition center, and the College of Charleston administers the Accelerated Learning center.

The Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership was established at Winthrop University in 1989 and then relocated to the University of South Carolina in 1995. The Center provides technical assistance and funding support to schools involved in restructuring. Currently, there are 100 schools involved in the Center's activities. Recently, the Center assumed responsibility for coordinating professional development school sites, bringing together five universities and colleges: the University of South Carolina, Winthrop College, Furman University, Benedict College, and Columbia College. Collectively, these higher education institutions form The South Carolina Collaborative to Renew Teacher Education, which is working with 30 schools across South Carolina to strengthen linkages between teacher education programs and professional growth at the building level. The Collaborative's activities are supported through institutional contributions and external grants.

Contacts/Information Resources

Russ Bedenbaugh
Director
Office of Professional Development
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-8558

John Robinson
Director
Office of Organizational Development
South Carolina Department of Education
1429 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803-734-8318

Sheila Gallagher
President
South Carolina Education Association
421 Zimacrest Drive
Columbia, SC 29210
803-772-6553

Publications and Reports

What is the Penny Buying for South Carolina?: Assessment of the Sixth Year of the South Carolina Education Improvement Act of 1984. South Carolina State Board of Education, Division of Public Accountability (1990).

"A Statewide Initiative in South Carolina." Ann Ishler. *The Journal of Staff Development*, Volume 16, No. 2. National Staff Development Council. (Spring 1995).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



South Dakota

Number of Teachers: 9,557

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 23%

Average Salary: \$25,259¹

Education Policy Context

South Dakota serves 135,494 students in its 177 public school districts. Traditionally a local control state, the South Dakota legislature has granted districts even greater control over education policy. In 1995, the state legislature discarded over 100 state laws and 500 administrative rules governing public education. This action seriously affected the South Dakota Department of Education and Cultural Affairs (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). The intent was to transform the SEA from a monitoring/regulatory agency to a support and service-oriented organization. The SEA's authority and budget were dramatically reduced. Rescinding these laws and regulations eradicated the state-required publication of school assessment results and the rebuilding of the school accreditation system. The funding for a "modernization" plan for 16 school districts implementing school reform was eliminated.

The South Dakota Initiative for Challenging Standards established standards in nine curriculum areas. The standards were developed by a partnership including the SEA, the South Dakota Initiative for Challenging Standards, the National Science Foundation funded Statewide Systemic Initiative (SSI), and the Comprehensive School Health Program. The standards were

adopted by the State Board of Education in June of 1996. Although the state standards are voluntary, it is anticipated that a new accreditation system will require schools to set local standards that meet or exceed the state standards. The partnership is currently reviewing teacher certification and recertification rules to align them with the standards, and is developing professional opportunities that will help educators teach to the standards.

The State Role in Professional Development

South Dakota has no state plan for professional development. However, the Standards Team, an SEA committee working on the content standards initiative, is planning professional development opportunities for the 1996-97 school year. The Standards Team is designing a model to facilitate professional development based on the standards. The state has integrated professional development into its Goals 2000 and SSI programs. Establishing continuing education units that would be applied toward recertification requirements is also under consideration.

Teacher Certification Policies.

Many requirements for the renewal of teaching certificates were eliminated in 1995 when the rules governing certification and recertification were reduced from 59 rules with 195 subdivisions to 19

rules with 31 subdivisions. The state is currently reviewing teacher certification and recertification policies. At present, teachers must renew their certificates every five years by earning six semester hours of credit. Three credits may be SEA-issued; the other three must be college credits. Provisional or master teacher certificates are not available. Teachers who earn advanced degrees may use those credits to renew their certificates twice during the ten-year period immediately following the awarding of the degree. Individuals earning advanced degrees beyond the master's may renew certificates upon completing 90 clock hours of professional development activities. A human relations requirement must be fulfilled by individuals in either situation. Teachers who obtain National Board Certification may waive one cycle of renewal requirements.

Credits must be earned from four-year, accredited institutions of higher education, but may be in the form of workshops, telecourses, independent studies, or correspondence courses. Community college credits are only accepted if transferred to a four-year institution. Credits from South Dakota's postsecondary technical institutes may be used if they articulate to a four-year institution, or if prior approval is given by the Office of Policy and Accountability.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Credits for recertification do not have to be linked to teaching assignments, although they usually must be linked to obtain salary increments. Credits must relate to areas in which the teacher is endorsed, be part of a local staff development plan, or lead to additional endorsements or degrees in education.

South Dakota has a process for approving in-service activities for recertification purposes. The criteria for approval include: explanation of the necessity of the program; identification of the competencies, knowledge, skills, and techniques on which teachers will focus; an agenda that indicates how the stated purpose will be accomplished; vitae of qualified instructors; and an evaluation process to measure the program's objectives. One-day workshops do not qualify unless part of a planned sequence of related professional development activities. Annual meetings of professional organizations qualify only on a "prearranged basis," and in-service instructors cannot receive renewal credit for conducting workshops. All applications must be sponsored by an in-state agency or organization, such as the South Dakota Education Association, Associated School Boards of South Dakota, School Administrators of South Dakota, local education agencies, education cooperatives, a group of collaborating districts, or the Division of Education. The director of teacher certification approves in-service education programs for certificate renewal credit based on review of the application.

The South Dakota Advisory Council on the Certification of Teachers was established by law in 1991. This advisory council is responsible for recommending criteria and procedures for evaluating teacher education programs, and teacher licensure requirements and renewal standards. The Council serves in an advisory capacity to the South Dakota Board of Education and the SEA.

State-Supported Programs. Under the restructured SEA, there is currently no office or staff person responsible for professional development policy in the state. The SEA offers occasional

workshops in specific program areas when resources and staff are available. Professional development is associated with the state's Goals 2000 grant.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The state is involved with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium and Goals 2000. It was involved in the National Science Foundation SSI project, under which the South Dakota SSI gave grants to school districts to improve teacher capacity.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state previously set aside funds for schools to reserve three days each year for professional development. This funding ended January 1, 1997. School funding from state education aid and local property taxes is set at \$3,350 per pupil for 1996-97; that figure will increase annually by the rate of inflation or 3 percent, whichever is lower.

Federal Funds. The state currently receives Goals 2000 funds and previously received NSF funding for professional development. The state receives Eisenhower money and Title I funds that are used to support professional development in districts. In FY 1995, the state received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funding.

Local Funds. Local tax dollars are believed to be the largest source of funding for professional development. There is no state mandate for local professional development spending. Teachers generally pay their own expenses to earn college credits.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

At one time, the state required districts to establish staff development plans and provide funding to cover teacher salaries for three days of staff development. These requirements were eliminated in 1995; the funding expired in 1996.

Large districts often provide staff development activities by bringing in outside consultants. Education cooperatives satisfy some professional development needs of districts. Many schools have established staff development committees comprised of teachers, but this practice varies from district to district.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is sometimes negotiated locally. Teachers generally pay for the expenses they incur for professional development activities, but some schools reimburse them. Districts advance teachers on their salary schedules based on professional development activities; again, the process varies by district.

Teacher evaluation is no longer required in South Dakota, due to the 1995 law that rescinded many of the state's education laws and regulations.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The South Dakota Education Association (SDEA) offers professional development workshops and conferences for its members. The SDEA often makes arrangements with the SEA to provide recertification credit for teacher participation in these activities.

Subject-matter organizations offer professional development for their members, although these activities do not always apply toward recertification credit.

Institutions of higher education are a substantial provider of professional development for South Dakota teachers. The University of South Dakota operates a professional development school that has been in existence for three years. Most colleges in the state develop relationships with local districts and offer workshops to meet their professional development needs. Institutions of higher education were collaborative

partners in the state's SSI grant, and have been involved in the proposed revisions of the certification and recertification rules and teacher education program standards.

The Curriculum Center is a private non-profit organization that is part of an educational cooperative. The Center is funded by grants from the SEA and the federal government to develop school improvement resources. It provides professional development in curriculum development, portfolio assessment, integrated curriculum, and leadership training. The Curriculum Center worked closely with the SEA to write the state's content standards.

The Technology and Innovations in Education (TIE) office receives state and federal funding to provide professional development regarding technology. The TIE annual conference is attended by approximately 3,000 educators.

Corporations, such as US West, offer workshops and other professional development opportunities for South Dakota's teachers.

Contacts/Information Resources

Lynda Sederstrom
Director of Teacher Education and Certification
South Dakota Department of Education
and Cultural Affairs
700 Governor's Drive
Pierre, SD 57501-2291
605-773-3134

Charlain Gatje
South Dakota Teachers Association
411 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501
605-224-9263

Peggy Blair
Director
South Dakota Curriculum Center
435 South Chapelle
Pierre, SD 57501
605-773-3134

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Tennessee

Number of Teachers: 46,066

Average Years of Experience: 15

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 42%

Average Salary: \$30,514¹

Education Policy Context

Tennessee's Education Improvement Act (EIA) of 1992 provides the guiding force for education policy in the state. This legislation created the 21st Century Schools Program, which established school district and school performance goals, value-added assessment, and a local reward/sanction accountability system. Other key components of the program include class size reduction, reforms in secondary curriculum, and mandatory kindergarten. All of these objectives will be fully implemented by the year 2000. The EIA also enacted the Basic Education Program (BEP), a new school funding formula which was instituted to provide equitable and adequate state funds for public education. A temporary sales tax increase was authorized to generate additional revenue.

The EIA created a new direction for the Tennessee State Board of Education (SBE), one that shifted its historic role of prescribing instructional practice towards a more focused role of establishing vision and support systems for districts to achieve high academic outcomes. The SBE outlined performance goals in five areas: student learning, proficiency skills, graduation, promotion, and attendance. In 1995, the SBE issued its annual *Master Plan for Tennessee Schools*, identifying nine

priority areas (incorporating Goals 2000 components) deemed necessary to achieve its student performance goals. The nine areas are: (1) early childhood education; (2) primary and middle grades education; (3) high school education; (4) technology; (5) professional development and teacher education; (6) accountability and assessment; (7) school leadership and school-based decision making; (8) school safety; and (9) equity funding.

The use of technology is a major focus of the EIA. Through the 21st Century Classroom Project, EIA funds a computerized network involving all Tennessee public schools and the State Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). It also funds teacher training for the integration of technology into classroom instruction and technology coordinators in each district. The project equips classrooms with multimedia teachers, presentation stations, and four networked student computers. All 21st Century Classroom teachers receive 30 hours of training in the use of technology for classroom instruction. Since the project began in 1993, 4,000 classroom teachers have participated. Three state-operated technology training centers were created, and teacher education programs are now required to incorporate technology training into their curricula in order to obtain accreditation. In 1995, the legislature committed addi-

tional resources to equip every school library with a computer linked to a statewide network via the Internet. Librarians received training to use the equipment. The goal is for all Tennessee schools to "join hands electronically" by the 1996-97 school year.

The State Role in Professional Development

The Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) of 1984 mandated that the SBE develop a state policy regarding professional development. In turn, the SEA was directed to collaborate with the state's three Administrative Study Councils (for superintendents, instructional supervisors, and school principals) and the Tennessee Teachers Study Council to design and implement professional development opportunities. The outgrowth of this activity was the development of the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders (TASL) and the Tennessee Executive Development program—two initiatives that have provided training for school administrators, instructional supervisors, and superintendents. Teacher professional development, at that time, focused on preparing teachers for career ladders.

The 1995 Master Plan for Tennessee Schools expanded state policies in this area. The plan identifies the SEA's role in providing opportunities for professional development through state-spon-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

sored institutes, academies, and workshops. In addition, the SEA is responsible for establishing "a statewide [electronic] clearinghouse of information" on innovative practices and training resources.

Primary responsibility for professional development is placed at the local level. Districts and schools are encouraged to create flexible scheduling to increase professional development time within the school structure, to strengthen linkages between professional development activities and school improvement goals, and to use technology to support professional development activities. Although the plan does not mandate specific activities, it does outline target areas in which professional development is needed in order to obtain EIA goals. The professional development target areas are:

- teaching strategies to ensure that all children are successful;
- use of assessment to improve teaching and learning;
- use of technology to enhance learning;
- school-based decision making;
- non-graded, multi-aged classrooms for primary students;
- curricular, instructional, and scheduling strategies to implement middle school concepts;
- curriculum integration;
- early childhood education, parenting skills, and family resource centers;
- mentoring support for beginning teachers and administrators; and
- parental involvement.

Teacher Certification Policies. Licensure policies are administered by the SEA's Office of Teacher Licensing. Prior to 1984, Tennessee offered only one type of teaching certificate, the Professional License, which was renewable

every ten years. CERA restructured the teacher licensing system into a three-tiered model.

Upon completion of preservice requirements, new teachers are now issued a five-year, renewable Probationary License, which may be upgraded after one year of teaching service and satisfactory completion of a local evaluation. Currently, Tennessee does not mandate a program for beginning teachers; however, in 1988, the SBE sought funding to support a state-sponsored internship/induction program for new teachers. This policy would have given teachers the option of either enrolling in a fifth-year internship program as part of their teacher education programs or participating in a first-year induction program. Although funding for this activity was not passed by the legislature, SBE officials report that many districts are implementing new teacher support programs on their own. Similarly, several teacher education programs in the state are offering a fifth-year internship to their students.

Once teachers reach the second tier, they are issued a five-year, renewable Apprentice License that is upgraded after four years of in-state teaching service. Third-tier teachers receive a Professional License that is renewable every ten years. Recertification requirements vary, depending on the highest degree earned. Teachers at the bachelor's level must complete six semester hours of undergraduate or graduate credit in order to renew their licenses. Teachers with master's degrees are not required to earn additional course credit but must be in active teaching service for at least five years within each ten-year cycle.

The State Certification Commission (formerly known as the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and Certification) is a statutory body that was reactivated in 1986 for the purpose of examining existing regulations and providing policy recommendations to the SBE. The Commission's membership is appointed by the SBE; two-thirds are K-12 educators, and other members include college or university faculty, SBE members, and SEA staff. The full Commission meets three times each year. Ad hoc committees meet on a more frequent

basis to conduct research and provide recommendations on teacher policies. Currently, the SEA's Office of Career Ladder Certification is piloting a new model for teacher evaluations. The model would incorporate Tennessee's teaching competencies, reflect Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, and emphasize professional growth for experienced teachers.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA recently restructured its management operations for state-sponsored professional development. Under the newly formed Division of Training and Professional Development, the SEA commits a staff of 30 (including program directors, resource specialists, and administrative coordinators) to promote and strengthen leadership within local school systems. The SEA also maintains a Division of Teaching and Learning that provides professional development focused on subject-matter and content standards. State-sponsored professional development programs serve superintendents, school administrators, board members, and teachers. The SEA has contracted with the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis to evaluate state-sponsored professional development activities in terms of their impact and alignment with educators' needs. A report on evaluation findings was released in June of 1996.

The SEA introduced its Teacher Leadership Development program in 1992. The program consists of week-long, summer in-service academies for Teachers of Writing and Foreign Language; a Cooperative Learning Institute; Tennessee's Teacher of the Year Award; the Teacher Study Council; Project PASS, which is a minority teacher recruitment program; and Positive Attitudes for Tennessee Schools (PATS), which provides training in effective schools concepts such as student self-esteem, learning styles, and school climate and focuses on local school improvement planning. The Academy for Teachers as Leaders, the Academy for Teachers in a Diverse Society, and the Alternative Assessment Workshop were added in the summer of 1996. Other

activities include advanced Internet workshops. The SEA collaborates with universities and other professional development providers to implement this program.

Each academy serves between 50 and 150 teachers annually, while over 1,000 teachers participate each year in the institutes. Since 1989, 204 schools have participated in PATS training, which is provided according to a three-year cohort cycle. It should be noted that, while administrators and board members are required to attend certain state-sponsored professional development activities, participation in teacher training activities is optional and provided on a "first come, first served" basis.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Tennessee is using its Goals 2000 funds to support school reform initiatives in the areas of staff development and preservice training. Competitive grants are available to school systems, individual schools, and consortia. A total of 116 projects have been awarded Goals 2000 subgrants, ranging from \$26,000 to \$241,000. Many of these projects have included teacher professional development opportunities.

The Memphis public school district has received an Urban Systemic Initiative (USI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). This grant provides substantial support for teacher professional development.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not provide categorical funds to support local professional development. SEA-sponsored professional development activities are supported largely through state appropriations. In 1994-95, the state spent \$3.1 million on SEA-sponsored professional development programs. This total includes professional development for superintendents, school administrators, and teachers. Of this amount, funds for teacher professional development programs included \$1.7 million for 21st Century Classroom Training, which provided funds for

computer equipment, training, and technical support; \$300,000 for PATS; \$130,000 for Teachers of Writing and Foreign Language; \$60,000 for the Academy for Teacher Leaders; \$40,000 for the Teacher Study Council; \$35,000 for Alternative Assessment Workshops; \$30,000 for the Academy for Teachers in a Diverse Society; \$22,000 for the Cooperative Learning Institute; and \$10,000 for the Tennessee Teacher of the Year Award.

Federal Funds. In 1995-96, Tennessee received a \$3.7-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant and a \$1.5-million Goals 2000 grant.

Local Funds. Districts are encouraged to use state and local funds for professional development in the areas of focus outlined in the SBE's professional development policy. The majority of funds for local professional development activities is provided through federal Eisenhower funds. Districts may use Career Ladder extended contract dollars for professional development (see below).

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The EIA requires that districts submit to the SEA an annual school improvement plan that includes professional development activities. The law further requires that in-service days be used in accordance with the professional development objectives outlined in the plans. The existing school calendar includes ten non-instructional days, five of which are specified for local in-service activities. In December of 1995, the SBE adopted a new rule intended to provide more time for professional development. Schools may extend the regular day by 30 minutes, accumulating 2.5 hours each week, which can then be used for early dismissal. This rule is intended to encourage school-based professional development and collegial planning time during the regular school schedule.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Tennessee statute allows collective bargaining at the local level. The state salary schedule awards a \$600 increment for the completion of graduate study in subject-matter or pedagogy-related content at the master's, master's plus 30 credits, and doctorate levels. Officials report that districts normally supplement this increment. Teachers are not reimbursed for tuition costs.

In 1984, Tennessee became one of the first states in the nation to implement a Career Ladder program. Teachers must obtain the Professional License in order to participate. To become eligible, they must also successfully complete a state-conducted evaluation process and have the appropriate years of teaching experience—four years for Level I, eight years for Level II, and 12 years for Level III. Teachers who meet the criteria receive a ten-year, renewable Career Ladder Certificate, which entitles them to annual salary supplements of \$1,000 for Level I, \$2,000 for Level II, and \$3,000 for Level III. Career Ladder teachers may also receive extended contracts of up to eight weeks, which are awarded based on their schools' needs. Teachers earn \$2,000 for each month of an extended contract.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Tennessee Education Association (TEA), through its Instruction and Professional Development (IPD) division, offers training activities throughout the year to assist teachers in becoming effective advocates and practitioners of professional growth. The IPD division is staffed by three full-time coordinators and a field team of over 30 presenters who provide training workshops at districts' and schools' requests. Every year, TEA sponsors three one-day IPD conferences on a pedagogical topic (e.g., authentic assessment or educational technology). IPD conferences attract 100 participants per site.

TEA also sponsors several three-day conferences, on topics such as Minority Issues, Technology, and Women's Concerns, that include training workshops. TEA training services are supported through membership dues.

Three institutions of higher education (IHE)—the University of Memphis, Vanderbilt-Peabody College, and the University of Tennessee—have helped to establish professional development schools (PDS). Sixteen PDS sites currently operate in the state, 11 of which were initiated by the University of Memphis' Professional Development School Program, which began in 1990. Vanderbilt-Peabody College operates three PDS sites, and the University of Tennessee maintains two sites. Currently, 400 teachers participate in this program and receive 51 hours of staff training. An IHE faculty member is assigned to the school on a part-time basis to serve as the key liaison between the school and IHE staff. IHE faculty secure resources and provide technical assistance as needed.

Partners in Public Education is a public education fund that was created in 1994 to promote education restructuring in Memphis City Schools. The fund provided resources to create a Teaching and Learning Academy, which opened in April of 1996. The goal of the Academy is to reshape the mode of teacher training activities offered by the district from that of stand-alone, in-service workshops to ongoing, professional development experiences that are interconnected and aligned with an instructional mission statement. The Academy serves all of the district's approximately 6,000 teachers. Memphis is also one of ten New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) jurisdictions in the nation and receives professional development resources and opportunities through this initiative.

Contacts/Information Resources

Susan Hudson
Division of Training and Professional Development
Tennessee Department of Education
Fifth Floor, Gateway Plaza
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243-0376
615-532-4713

Alphonso Mance
Assistant Executive Director
Tennessee Education Association
801 Second Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37201-1099
615-242-8392

E. Dean Butler
Director
Center for Research in Educational Policy
The University of Memphis
Education Annex 1
Memphis, TN 38152
901-678-2310

Publications and Reports

Master Plan for Tennessee Schools: Preparing for the 21st Century. Tennessee State Board of Education (1995).

Challenges and Issues in Tennessee Education: A 1995 Profile. E. Dean Butler. Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis (August 1995).

"Professional Development Policy for Tennessee's Schools." Tennessee State Board of Education (July 31, 1992).

Tennessee's Teacher Education Policy: A Mid-Course Assessment. Advisory Council on Teacher Education and Certification, Tennessee State Board of Education (November 19, 1993).

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Texas

Number of Teachers: 224,830

Average Years of Experience: 13

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 27%

Average Salary: \$30,519*

Education Policy Context

Texas, the second largest state in the nation, has 1,046 districts and 6,465 campuses in its public education system. It continues to be challenged with meeting the demands of an ever-growing and diverse student population and has undergone massive changes regarding education policy in recent years. In the 1995 legislative session, the entire education code was rewritten through Senate Bill 1 to reduce rules and regulations, to address the granting of waivers from rules and regulations that place barriers on student achievement, to provide greater flexibility for campuses and communities, and to create opportunities for increased local decision making. In addition, the new governor, George W. Bush, has emphasized pursuing four educational themes: enhanced local control, a high degree of accountability, a focus on core curriculum areas, and school safety.

The State Role in Professional Development

Education leaders recognize the critical link between professional development and improved student achievement. Texans believe that standards promote systemic change, and the state has already enacted standards that focus on creating a lifelong learning

community. In 1994, the Texas Education Agency (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) presented "a comprehensive and coherent professional development system that links all aspects of the education profession."

The process for developing this system took more than three years to complete and involved the collaboration of hundreds of professionals to define what teachers, administrators, and other educators should know and be able to do. Texas is a member of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and has used INTASC standards in formulating its teacher proficiencies and teacher appraisal system. INTASC recommendations were also used in developing standards for continuing teacher professional development.

Texas' teacher proficiencies focus on learner-centered knowledge, instruction, communication, and professional development, as well as equity and excellence for all learners. The mastery of identified proficiencies at different levels provides a career-long professional development plan for teachers and administrators.

Teacher Certification Policies.

Applicants for a teaching certificate are required to have a degree in an academic major. (Undergraduate education degrees have not been granted since 1991.) The final step for initial certification is to

pass at least two tests of the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET), one in education pedagogy and one in a subject or specialty. Teachers who successfully complete an approved teacher education program are eligible for a Lifetime Provisional Certificate. Teachers who possess a graduate degree and/or a special service certificate are eligible for Lifetime Professional Certificates. The state also has established provisions for emergency and alternative certifications.

Since 1993, it has been required that all beginning teachers be assigned a mentor and attend a teacher orientation. The specific activities attached to these requirements are not funded by the state and are determined by local school districts. Many districts have developed their own mentor training programs, based on the *Mentoring Framework for Texas Teachers*, a document developed by the SEA.

The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) was created in 1995. Authorized through Senate Bill 1, the SBEC was established "to recognize public school educators as professionals and to grant educators the authority to govern the standards of their profession." Its voting membership is comprised of four teachers, two administrators, one counselor, and five citizens; non-voting members include one dean from a college of education and two members representing the state's com-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

missioners of education and higher education. The 12 voting members and the dean are appointed by the governor.

By statute, the SBEC is required to establish license renewal requirements that will, in effect, eliminate lifetime certification. In addition, some professional development requirements will fall under this board's jurisdiction. As the SBEC undertakes this restructuring process, the state's teacher proficiencies will serve as a foundation for discussion. The SBEC must have continuing education and certificate renewal requirements in place no later than November 1, 1997.

State-Supported Programs. The state supports several major professional development initiatives. Primary among these are Texas' 20 Education Service Centers (ESCs) and the 26 Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDTs). ESC staff respond to district and school requests for technical assistance and training and also provide administrative support. The ESCs serve a critical role in coordinating and supporting "educator mentor networks" that have been developed at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. They also serve as forums for information sharing and curriculum development. Some mentor schools have been selected as Reading Spotlight Schools to support the governor's and the state's reading initiative. The purpose of identifying these public schools is to showcase a variety of programs operating in Texas that are known to be successful in developing reading skills, particularly in grades K-3.

The CPDTs were created by the legislature in 1991 as collaborative initiatives between and among universities, ESCs, school districts, and local businesses. The Centers provide intensive, field-based teacher preparation programs, serve as demonstration sites for integrating technology and innovative teaching practices into classrooms, and offer ongoing professional development for practicing teachers. Eight centers were started in 1993, with six added in 1994 and three in 1995. The legislature's intention was to fund start-up, but to have ESCs rely on customer payment for services to support their

continuation. As mandated by the Education Code enacted in 1995, CPDTs are regulated by the SBEC.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Texas Science and Mathematics Renaissance (TSMR) is funded by a five-year, \$10-million State-wide Systemic Initiative (SSI) grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). A portion of the SSI funds is used to implement professional development in math and science. Three of the state's largest districts—Dallas, El Paso and San Antonio—have received NSF Urban Systemic Initiatives (USI) grants.

Texas' Goals 2000 plan, Academics 2000, supports the newly revised state education code and awards grants to schools for improving core content areas, particularly reading in the early grades. A portion of Academics 2000 funds has been used to establish Centers for Educator Development, which provide training in reading and social studies. The Centers will model effective staff development practices that exemplify good instruction, including the new Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). The Reading Center, located at the University of Texas at Austin, is a collaboration with ESC Region XIII and the Austin Independent School District. The Social Studies Center is located at the ESC for Region VI and represents a collaboration with Texas A&M University. Academics 2000 funds will also be used to add a technology component to the Centers.

The Rockefeller Foundation has provided funding for an innovative professional development project in San Antonio, one of the state's largest districts. Each school has a full-time school-based trainer, called an instructional guide, who serves as a coach and collaborator for the implementation of new instructional strategies. Future training for the instructional guides will include strengthening their knowledge of academic content. Guides not only work with teachers and staff in their schools, but also work across their districts—in effect, creating a learning network that fosters the ability of schools to learn from each other. Plans call for expanding this network to include parents and community members.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. Texas does not allocate state funds directly to districts for professional development. The CPDTs are funded under a special appropriation; they received \$13.2 million for 1993, \$12.2 million for 1994, and \$9.3 million for 1995. The ESCs receive an annual statewide appropriation of \$5 million per year; \$2.5 million goes directly to the ESCs, and the remaining funds are dispersed either to school districts or to the ESCs, depending on the provider that individual districts choose to deliver additional staff development services. ESCs and CPDTs are required to submit annual performance reports to the SEA, which are considered in the determination of future funding.

Federal Funds. Texas received \$7,293,999 in Goals 2000 funding in 1994, \$29,228,278 in 1995, and \$27,187,479 in 1996. In 1995-96, Texas received \$16,633,568 in Eisenhower funds to support teacher professional development.

Local Funds. Districts use a combination of local, state, and federal funds to support local professional development. Districts pay fees to obtain services from ESCs and CPDTs.

The Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Senate Bill 1 directs that professional development be primarily campus-based and related to achieving campus performance objectives. It also stipulates that school-based decision-making committees develop and approve staff development for the campus and that district-level decision-making committees develop and approve staff development for the district. The Bill states:

Campus staff development may include activities that enable the campus staff to plan together to enhance existing skills, to share effective strategies, to reflect on curricular and instructional issues, to analyze student achievement

results, to reflect on means of increasing student achievement, to study research, to practice new methods, to identify students' strengths and needs, to develop meaningful programs for students, to appropriately implement site-based decision-making, and to conduct action research. The campus staff development activities may be conducted using study teams, individual research, peer coaching, workshops, seminars, conferences, or other reasonable methods that have the potential to improve student achievement.

In 1995, the commissioner of education recommended a 20-day staff development requirement to enable school staffs to meet the high state standards. No legislation was passed, and the cost, when calculated, was astronomical. Currently, there are provisions that would allow schools up to five professional development days during the 1996-97 school year.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The state minimum teacher salary schedule has 21 steps (0-20) which are based solely on years of experience and are adjusted as a function of state spending per student. The majority of districts supplement the state's minimum schedule based on degrees earned, credits earned, merit, and other factors. State law prohibits collective bargaining.

The state does not fund a reimbursement program for tuition or other professional development activities. Such compensation may be provided at the discretion of a district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The SEA collaborates with numerous professional educator associations and subject-matter groups throughout the state to sponsor conferences and workshops.

The Texas Staff Development Council (TSDC) provides leadership and support for effective staff development programs and practices in the state. Since 1992, TSDC has engaged in networking activities, provided direct services, and participated in state planning committees to influence policy makers and other organizations regarding the importance of professional development in achieving school improvement. In addition to its annual statewide conference, TSDC publishes a biannual newsletter and conducts several "special topic" seminars throughout the year.

Contacts/Information Resources

Mark Littleton
Executive Director
State Board for Educator Certification
1001 Trinity
Austin, TX 78701
512-469-3000

Robin Gilchrist
Assistant Commissioner for Reading Initiatives
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
512-463-9027

Karen Howard
President
Texas Staff Development Council
405 East Davis Street
Mesquite, TX 75149
214-288-6411

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Utah

Number of Teachers: 19,053
 Average Years of Experience: 13
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 24%
 Average Salary: \$28,056¹

Education Policy Context

Utah's public education system has the fourth smallest number of districts (40) of any state in the nation. Utah is striving to meet the diverse needs of a rapidly growing student population, expected to reach 500,000 students by the year 2000, in its 716 schools. In 1991, Utah's governor and legislature commissioned a legislative task force to develop a mission for public education, set policy guidelines, and identify strategies for improving educational structures and student performance. The resulting *Utah State Public Education Strategic Plan* was issued in January of 1992 and formally adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) shortly thereafter. The plan outlined nine strategic areas to guide decision making regarding education policy: (1) create an accountable, outcome-based education system; (2) provide school choice to stimulate competitiveness and improvement; (3) allow greater school autonomy for instructional programming; (4) enhance teacher compensation and professionalism; (5) empower students to assume more responsibility in their learning; (6) utilize technology to enhance instruction; (7) provide and align staff training with school improvement goals; (8) involve businesses in education; and (9) inform community stakeholders.

While the *Strategic Plan* was effective in articulating a vision of school improvement, the financial resources needed to implement it were initially absent. Nonetheless, Utah schools developed strategic plans, integrated instructional technology, and created site-based decision-making councils. Funding to implement schools' strategic plans arrived in 1993, when newly elected Governor Mike Leavitt worked with the legislature and educators to enact HB 100, commonly referred to as the "Centennial Schools Program." Schools that apply and are accepted to participate in this program receive a one-year, non-restrictive \$5,000 base grant plus \$20 per student, based on yearly average attendance. The Governor's Office and the SBE select up to 100 schools each year to participate in the program, based on the implementation of a strategic plan, clear student performance goals, and student assessment strategies and on the integration of technology, parental involvement, and linkages with community and business organizations.

The State Role in Professional Development

In November of 1994, the Utah State Office of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) created a 35-member Staff Development

Task Force, which developed policy recommendations for the SEA and SBE regarding professional development. This effort has been conducted in collaboration with the Inservice Curriculum Council (ICC) and the Utah Staff Development Council (USDC). Since 1986, the ICC has assisted the SEA in identifying and designing programs that meet the staff development needs of local districts. The USDC was created in 1993 to provide a more formal structure for establishing statewide goals for professional development.

The Staff Development Task Force reviewed the national research literature, as well as existing Utah policies and funding patterns for staff development. The Task Force issued a report in July of 1995 that highlighted the following recommendations: develop a state policy for staff development; establish a full-time Staff Development Coordinator position within the SEA; appropriate 2 percent of the Minimal School Program for staff development activities at the local level and \$1 million for statewide preparation activities; establish an inter-sectional committee at the SEA and an advisory committee on staff development for the SBE; and encourage local districts to create a staff development policy, designate a staff development coordinator, align staff development activities with improvement goals, and evaluate their programs. Bills to support

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

these recommendations were introduced in the Utah legislature during the 1996 session; however, funding was not approved.

Teacher Certification Policies. Utah has two state-level advisory committees that focus on teacher certification. The State Advisory Committee on Certification, for the past 30 years, has recommended policies for teacher certification. The Committee consists of six classroom teachers, four principals, four district superintendents, the deans of teacher preparation programs, and one representative each from the teachers' association, the State Board of Regents, the PTA, the SEA, and the SBE. Recent Committee recommendations, which took effect in 1996, resulted in the modification of teacher preservice requirements to reflect Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards.

The Utah Professional Practices Advisory Committee oversees policies and procedures for revoking teaching certification. Established by the legislature in 1973, the Committee is charged with investigating any filed complaint that questions the professional conduct (pertaining to standards of competence or ethics) of a teacher or administrator. The 11-member committee is appointed for a three-year term by the state superintendent. The investigation process consists of a peer review and a formal hearing before a recommendation is issued to the SBE either to warn, reprimand, suspend, or revoke an educator's certification.

Currently, recertification requirements for Utah teachers are based solely on years of teaching experience. Upon completion of an accredited preservice program, teachers are issued a basic certificate that is renewable every five years, as long as the candidate has been an active classroom teacher for three years within that cycle. Utah's statute for teacher evaluation requires that new teachers participate in a mentoring program that is locally designed. Teacher association and SEA officials report, however, that the quality of teacher mentoring programs varies considerably

by district. In addition, the state does not monitor this activity.

State-Supported Programs. Coordinated through its Office of Teacher Certification and Personnel Development, the SEA conducts a annual series of "Summer Institutes" that are offered free of charge (unless credits are awarded) at locations throughout the state. The SEA utilizes a team of 23 staff specialists to facilitate the one- to two-week Institutes. An estimated 12,000 teachers participate in workshops that focus primarily on content area instruction but also include techniques in instructional technology, site-based management, interdisciplinary curriculum development, and parental involvement. The SEA publishes an annual listing of summer in-service activities conducted by the state and other providers such as higher education institutions and local districts.

Since 1993, the SEA's Office of Curriculum and Instruction has received an Inservice Fund, which is a set-aside appropriation from the legislature. The Inservice Fund supports statewide activities that assist teachers and administrators in understanding and implementing Utah's new core curricula in mathematics, science, language arts, and social studies. During the first two years, this effort focused on language arts and mathematics; in 1995-96 it focused on the science curriculum. While this activity is not mandatory, all 40 districts have participated.

State-funded Regional Service Centers (RSCs) were created in 1980 to respond directly to district superintendent requests for technical assistance and other resource information. There are four regionally based RSCs in Utah. Financial support for the RSCs was initially substantial and secured primarily through federal grants. In the past several years, however, one district official reported that funding cutbacks have reduced RSC allocations and have thus affected the quality and comprehensiveness of their services. The Staff Development Task Force has recommended that the state fund a full-time professional development specialist at each RSC site.

The SEA's Educational Technology Initiative (ETI) Project Office was formed in 1990 with the enactment of HB 468, which promoted the use of technology in the state's public schools. The legislation provided funds and technical assistance to school districts that prepared and submitted a five-year technology plan to the state. Districts are currently in the process of writing new five-year technology plans, which must include a comprehensive in-service component. According to SEA application guidelines, 25 percent of districts' ETI funds must be allocated for this purpose.

The SEA also funds events and activities conducted by the USDC. USDC-coordinated staff development activities focus on collegial practice and organizational restructuring issues. Utilizing a trainer-trainee model of service delivery, USDC recruits nationally renowned consultants to work with teacher-leaders, who subsequently share their expertise with districts and schools throughout the state.

Federal-or Foundation-Supported Programs. Created in 1991, the Utah Agenda for Meeting the Needs of Students with Disabilities sets out a strategic plan for providing each disabled student with a learning environment that will enable him or her "to become a caring, competent, and contributing citizen in an integrated, diverse, and changing society." The Agenda is being implemented in conjunction with the state's overall strategic education plan. Its activities are managed by the SEA's Special Education Services Unit and supported primarily through federal funds provided by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Professional development, one of nine strategic areas outlined in the plan, is being addressed by a strategic planning team that represents an interagency system of planning, training, and implementation. One key outgrowth of the Agenda is the Utah Project on Inclusion, which provides technical assistance to schools that have adopted inclusion models and that have set high expectations for all students. The Agenda also developed the Behavioral and Educational Strategies for Teachers (BEST)

Program, which establishes lighthouse schools at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. BEST schools model exemplary teaching methods in building social competence skills for students.

Also funded through IDEA, the Utah Special Education Consortium (established in 1980) conducts joint planning and brainstorming sessions to address students' needs. Two projects that provide professional development services to teachers and administrators have emerged from the Consortium. The first program, the Utah Learning Resource Center, was established in 1976 to respond to district requests for information and on-site technical assistance. Participant records indicate that 60 to 70 percent of all Resource Center users are regular, classroom-licensed educators. For the past ten years, the second program, the Utah Mentor Teacher Academy, has trained experienced teachers and administrators to become in-school consultants. Academy participants enroll in a two-year training program, and the Academy admits 40 new candidates every year. A total of 500 educators have completed the program. The Academy hosts an annual conference for all program graduates to promote discussion and networking among these in-school consultants.

Utah's Goals 2000 funds are being utilized to support local initiatives that encourage professional growth for classroom teachers and other school personnel. The USDC assisted six districts in submitting proposals; one effort resulted in a \$35,000 grant for the Salt Lake City district to develop a trainer-trainee model for curriculum integration.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The state does not provide categorical funding to support local professional development. Data compiled by the Staff Development Task Force calculated totals of \$7.4 million in state funds and \$5.9 million in federal funds that were used for professional development during 1994-95. Of those state funds, approximately 73 percent

was distributed to districts and schools in the form of competitive grants.

The Educational Technology Initiative received an initial \$66-million state allocation in 1990. The 1995-96 allocation for this program totaled approximately \$7 million. The Office of Curriculum and Instruction received an initial 1993 line-item allocation of \$350,000 for Core Curriculum development activities that, as of 1995-96, has been increased to \$1.5 million.

In 1995-96, each of the state's four RSCs received an allocation of \$200,000. Utah's Career Ladder program (see below) is entirely state-funded and operates on an average annual budget of \$40 million. The SEA has provided \$40,000 over the past three years to support USDC training activities.

Federal Funds. Utah was awarded Goals 2000 grants of \$620,000 for 1995-96 and \$2.2 million for 1996-97 to support local professional development initiatives. Approximately \$3.5 million in special education (IDEA) funds support the Utah Agenda and Special Education Consortium initiatives. Utah received a \$1.8-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant in 1995-96.

Local Funds. Funds for locally sponsored professional development are allocated at the district's discretion. Typically, districts use Career Ladder options (see below) as a primary source of professional development funds, although the extent and nature of this activity varies greatly. State guidelines for ETI grantees were revised for 1995-96, encouraging participating districts to allocate a minimum of 25 percent of their grants for teacher in-service activities.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The state's Centennial Schools Program mandates that participating schools develop a strategic plan. Professional development is strongly encouraged as a component of the plan but is not required. New application guidelines for ETI require that teacher in-service activities be a component of districts' technology plans, but do not mandate a

minimum budget allocation to support these activities. Based on recommendations from the Staff Development Task Force, the SBE and the SEA (in conjunction with others) will begin to develop a state policy for professional development that may eventually lead to increased planning and resource support for this activity at the local level.

Both SEA and district officials report that funds provided through the Career Ladder Program are most often used to add extended contract days that allow time for teacher planning and in-service activities. Districts that utilize this option are allowed to add up to six additional contract days. The regular school-year calendar consists of 180 days with no minimum set-aside for non-instructional activities. Officials estimate that most districts allocate between one and five non-instructional days per year, supported primarily through Career Ladder funds.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Nearly all districts provide some type of salary schedule increase based on experience and/or additional college degrees or credits earned. Teacher compensation for participation in professional development activities is determined locally. An SEA official reported that federally funded in-service activities were more likely to provide expenses reimbursement or stipends than state-funded activities.

Since 1985, Utah has offered a Career Ladder program that provides funding incentives to promote teacher professional growth. Districts are allocated funds based on weighted pupil units and the number of certified staff. Based on local bargaining agreements, districts may choose from several Career Ladder options: teacher performance bonuses, awarded based on excellence; extended contract days, which are paid, non-instructional days beyond the regular school year; teacher in-service training stipends; job enlargement, providing extra pay for extra work; and teacher shortage funds to pay for additional teachers.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Utah Education Association (UEA) offers numerous training events and activities through its Instruction and Professional Development Program. UEA sponsors three major events that focus on enhancing teacher skills and updating their subject-matter knowledge. Attended by an estimated 7,000 to 10,000 teachers per year, the UEA's annual fall convention is a two-day event that offers workshops and seminars on subject matter and pedagogy. UEA also hosts winter and summer conferences on various professional, educational, and curriculum topics and conducts monthly professional development workshops during the school year. UEA's Professional Development Program has been a leader in providing training in site-based decision-making concepts, processes, and skills. In addition, training is offered by request to individual schools, districts, and local associations in topics such as conflict resolution, time management, and strategic planning. The majority of UEA training activities are offered free of charge. The UEA also collaborates with the SEA and other groups to co-sponsor training events and conferences.

Faculty at the University of Utah's Graduate School of Education (GSE) provide high-quality professional development activities to principals, school counselors, school psychologists, and special education teachers throughout the state. Regarding elementary and secondary teachers, GSE's Department of Educational Studies provides a wide variety of professional development opportunities. In 1978, the Department initiated school-based Professional Development Centers (PDCs). In 1987, the University, in conjunction with local school districts, established seven Professional Development Schools (PDSs) and 15 related collaborative Teacher Education Sites (TESs). The Masters Cooperative Program is a two-year course of graduate study that allows teachers to systematically study their practice and participate in on-site coursework. Every two years, a cohort

of 25 teachers is admitted to the program, which entails two graduate courses per quarter. Efforts are currently underway to establish a similar program for teachers with a master's degree. Action Research Teams are created to provide an ongoing forum for classroom teachers to study their own practice. The University of Utah provides teachers at PDS sites with a 50 percent tuition reduction and library privileges.

The Brigham Young University (BYU)-Public School Partnership, created in 1983, is a collaborative among BYU's College of Education and five Utah school districts. It currently serves 38 schools. The Partnership focuses on four major areas: preservice, in-service, curriculum development, and research. Preservice teachers are placed in partnership schools for a one-year internship and work with an experienced teacher mentor and a BYU faculty member. Each year, four elementary school teachers are released from their classroom assignments to serve as "Faculty Associates" who provide technical assistance to other teachers, university faculty, and preservice candidates. A Teacher Leadership Master's Degree program allows partner school teachers to assume leadership roles while remaining in the classroom; 18 teachers participated in this program during its first year. Partnership activities are continually expanding and, with assistance from the DeWitt Wallace Fund, a Center of Pedagogy at BYU was established in 1995.

Contacts/Information Resources

Bruce Griffin
Associate Superintendent for Strategic Planning
Utah State Office of Education
250 E. 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801-538-7762

Roger Mouritsen
Coordinator
Teacher Certification and Professional Development
Utah State Office of Education
250 E. 500 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801-538-7741

Betty Condie
Director of Professional Development
Utah Education Association
875 E. 5180 South
Murray, UT 84107
801-266-4461, ext. 117

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Vermont

Number of Teachers: 8,102
 Average Years of Experience: 15
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 48%
 Average Salary: \$34,517¹

Education Policy Context

Vermont is a small state with a strong tradition of local control over public education policy. Its public school population is approximately 105,000 students enrolled in 340 schools that are organized into 281 school districts. Many districts are comprised of a single school, reflecting a tradition of small towns and a desire for school-level autonomy. There are 60 supervisory unions across the state. Each union has a central administration with a superintendent who administers multiple districts and reports to multiple local school boards.

Vermont is currently implementing a variety of statewide education reforms, most notably, a new curriculum framework based on the Vermont Framework of Standards and Learning Opportunities. Since the 1991-92 school year, Vermont has been implementing a new performance-based statewide assessment system that centers on student portfolios in math and writing. Portfolio assessment is conducted in grades 4 and 8 for mathematics and in grades 5 and 8 for writing. A science assessment and a math portfolio for grades 9-12 was added during the 1995-96 school year. Accompanying the new portfolio program was the establishment of teacher portfolio networks for training teachers to score portfolios and implement the portfolio process. In addition, Vermont has been

reforming its school accreditation system, changing the delivery of special education and social services in the schools, and attempting to resolve school finance issues.

All these reforms have implications for teachers. The Vermont Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) has been challenged to keep pace with the growing demands and needs of districts and their educators.

The State Role in Professional Development

Vermont has been addressing teacher standards and professional development as part of its reform efforts. The State Board of Education (SBE) created the Vermont Standards Board for Professional Educators in 1989 to regulate teacher licensure and relicensure, and to approve teacher education programs. The Standards Board reports to the SBE and is staffed by the SEA. It is composed of 23 members, who are primarily teachers, administrators, higher education representatives, members of local standards boards (LSBs), and the Commissioner of Education who serves as an ex-officio member. The Standards Board is connected to LSBs that govern local policies regarding professional development. Each supervisory union must establish an LSB, which is responsible for recommending teachers to the

state Standards Board for license renewal. While LSBs must comply with the regulations set by the Standards Board, they may add supplemental criteria or standards.

A statewide plan for professional development, presented to the SBE in May of 1995, would integrate different state-level activities into one coordinated plan for teacher professional development. Although the plan met with SBE approval, it is being implemented incrementally. The plan focused on three areas: setting standards for teachers; widely communicating teacher professional development opportunities throughout the state; and creating a state policy structure that develops a prepared teaching force.

The SEA convened the Vermont Consortium for Professional Development, which consisted of state policy-makers and professional development providers, in 1991-92, to work with the Standards Board to assess the professional development needs of Vermont's teachers and to examine existing opportunities. The group developed guidelines and key principles (see below) and acquired a grant to initiate a statewide tracking system for professional development information. However, state funding for the Consortium was never appropriated, and the development of the tracking system was put on hold. Instead, the funds for the tracking system were applied to the state's

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Statewide Systemic Initiative, the Vermont Institute for Science, Math and Technology (VISMT), for an online information source about professional development.

The state Agency of Human Services (AHS) and the SEA division of special education have initiated a collaboration to address integrated services and professional development for teachers and human service workers. The AHS and SEA (specifically, its special education and teaching and learning units) are looking at strategic community planning for workers in both areas. They aim to coordinate and eliminate any overlap in the work that both agencies are doing in the communities, and to identify issues that cut across both disciplines.

Teacher Certification Policies. Teachers must complete portfolios at their undergraduate institutions before they may obtain initial licenses. Standards board approval of a teacher preparation program is contingent upon including beginning teacher portfolios as a part of the program. New teachers receive a two-year, level-one "Beginning Educator" license. The state has not mandated the support of new teachers.

After teachers receive their level-two or "Professional Educator" license, they must develop and implement a seven-year Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) and portfolio. IPDPs are based on the teacher's reflection on strengths and weaknesses, and the potential impact of professional development activities on student learning. The state Standards Board recommends that teachers incorporate school and district goals into their IPDPs. The teacher decides whether or not to involve a principal or other administrator in the design of the plan. These plans are monitored and approved by the LSB, which recommends teachers to the Standards Board for relicensure.

During the seven-year period of the IPDP, teachers must acquire nine relicensure credits per endorsement. College credits can be used to satisfy the requirement, but are not the only activities that apply. Credits can be accumulated through LSB-approved activity, such as action research, or through other "new learning" activities that a teacher may present to the LSB. According to one Vermont educator, the LSB will approve a learning activity as

long as the teacher can document answers to the questions—How do you expect to benefit students? and What new things did you learn from this experience?

Teachers are required to spread the nine credits over the five standards adopted by the Standards Board:

- **Learning**, or work in a teacher's specific content area;
- **Professional knowledge**, or work in the area of pedagogy;
- **Colleagueship**, or work that involves other teachers;
- **Advocacy**, or work that involves the larger community in local education issues and advocates the educational health of students; and
- **Accountability**, or the portfolio presented to a teacher's peers or the LSB.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA Office of Teaching and Learning has traditionally provided teacher profes-

Key Principles and Recommended Guidelines for Professional Development

Key Principles:

- is a dynamic, active process that encourages reflection;
- addresses the needs of educators, enhancing their knowledge and skills and thus the quality of student learning;
- addresses one or more of the five professional standards, all of which are addressed in the portfolio;
- embodies both non-traditional and traditional experiences—risk taking is valued and encouraged;
- includes experiences that may not directly apply to the goals stated in an educator's Individual Professional Development Plan and may not receive licensing credit, but are nonetheless worthy and should be documented.

Recommended Guidelines:

- Is the experience consistent with key principles?
- Does the experience address the individual's professional development goals?
- Are there outcomes for the educator and/or student that can be implemented, assessed, and documented by the professional?
- Is the professional development experience challenging to the individual, and does it result in professional growth?
- Is there documentation to support the request for credit that does not rely solely on the counting of hours?

Source: "Professional Development for Educators in Vermont." Vermont Standards Board for Professional Educators and the Vermont Consortium for Professional Development.

sional development for SEA initiatives and regulations. One SEA respondent estimated that 80 percent of SEA consultants provide continuing education for teachers. The SEA also provides in-service events for teachers on a regular basis.

Vermont's Portfolio Networks consist of groups of teachers organized by the state for professional development specifically related to the portfolio assessment program. The regional networks were organized in 1991 when portfolio assessment was implemented. Each of the 17 regions has network leaders in math and writing and for eighth-, fourth-, and fifth-grade teachers; most of the leaders are classroom teachers. The scheduling and location logistics of Network meetings are handled by the SEA. Network leaders work with the SEA to develop an agenda for the grade-level meetings held three or four times each year. The meetings concentrate on scoring training and on math instructional training to help students create their portfolios.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Vermont participates in a number of foundation sponsored and federally sponsored initiatives that have professional development components. These include: the Carnegie Middle Grades School State Policy initiative; Goals 2000 funding for local school districts; and a professional development school in Montpelier supported by Goals 2000 funds.

In 1993, a Statewide Systemic Initiative grant from the National Science Foundation established VISMT at the Vermont Technical College. VISMT has actively promoted and provided professional development in math and science. VISMT holds summer institutes focused on math and science content and pedagogy, and has served staff from over 55 percent of Vermont's schools. It is estimated that VISMT has served more than 10 percent of the state's school teachers. VISMT has organized conferences and sent VISMT staff to work directly in schools, particularly in those schools that send teams to summer institutes. VISMT publishes a resource directory of science, math, and technology programs and of professional development opportunities.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state education budget dedicated to professional development, although the state funds professional development activities through local contracts. The state Portfolio Networks receive approximately \$45,000 per year from the general fund. The SEA vocational and special education divisions dispense funds for teacher professional development. No dollar figure is available for the total amount the state spends for professional development.

Federal Funds. The state receives Eisenhower and Title I funds that are used to support local professional development. Vermont received \$1,243,473 in Eisenhower funding in FY 1995. Vermont gives Goals 2000 grants to local districts and other institutions for professional development. In Year 2, Vermont received \$1,272,847 in Goals 2000 funding, \$60,000 of which was awarded in professional development grants to local districts, an increase from \$40,000 awarded in Year 1.

Local Funds. The amount spent locally including local and federal funds for professional development is estimated at \$3 million. The state does not mandate how much local districts must spend on professional development for teachers, although the relicensure laws require districts to support teacher professional development. Responsibility for ensuring that teachers are licensed has historically fallen to the districts.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

State regulations require supervisory unions to establish LSBs, which govern teacher standards and professional development policy. The LSBs approve and review teachers' IPDPs, which are required for relicensure, recommend teachers to the state Standards Board for relicensure, and set local relicensure requirements. Teachers, chosen by their peers, make up the

majority of each LSB membership. Five regional standards boards, separate from the LSBs, set standards for administrators.

While districts are not required to adopt professional development plans, increasingly they are developing strategic plans for improving education. Although the state does not mandate a minimum number of days, eight is the estimated number of days typically dedicated to professional development in a school year.

The responsibility for selecting in-service topics varies by district: some larger districts have curriculum directors responsible for organizing in-service activities; some district-level committees determine topics and providers; and, sometimes, the LSBs provide input on the selection of in-service topics.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teachers bargain for professional development at the local level. Each local contract establishes its own package of reimbursements and salary increments. Teachers are commonly reimbursed for college tuition, although each district has different criteria governing how many credits it will reimburse, whether credits must be taken in graduate courses, and the cap placed on the total allowed for reimbursement.

Teachers receive salary increments for college coursework, although not usually for other forms of professional development.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Vermont chapter of the National Education Association conducts a two-day conference every year that includes professional development activities. Other teacher organizations, including subject organizations in the arts, math, English, library/media, (said to be very active) and gifted and talented, in the state also provide professional networking, sharing, and learning. Several Vermont schools participate in the

Vermont Alliance, which is attempting to form a statewide network of schools. A network of Vermont schools participate in the Carnegie Middle Grades Initiative.

Institutions of higher education seem to be the largest providers of professional development for Vermont teachers. They provide the traditional graduate and undergraduate coursework, administer professional development schools, and have representatives on the state Standards Board. Some higher education institutions have representation on LSBs as well. The University of Vermont sponsors regional summer School Development Institutes to which schools send teams with a specific agenda to accomplish, and university faculty provide targeted guidance. There are several professional development schools across the state. The University of Vermont College of Education hosted a national conference in the summer of 1996 for higher education and K-12 partners to share their experiences and expertise.

Contacts/Information Resources

Peg Meyer
External Manager
Teaching and Learning Team
Vermont Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
802-828-3111

Nancy Howe
Consultant
Vermont Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
802-828-2444

Bruce Richardson
School of Education
University of Vermont
309 Waterman Street
Burlington, VT 05405-0160
802-656-3424

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Virginia

Number of Teachers: 70,220

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 31%

Average Salary: \$33,472¹

Education Policy Context

Virginia's public K-12 system enrolls almost 1.1 million students and consists of 133 school divisions. State education codes support local decision-making and autonomy. In 1993, the State Board of Education (SBE) proposed a reform initiative to establish a state curriculum called the Common Core of Learning (CCL); however, public opposition to the proposal eventually led to its rejection. Attention to the issue of curriculum standards was renewed in 1994, when Governor Allen appointed a 49-member education advisory panel, the Commission on Champion Schools, to develop recommendations for improving the academic performance of Virginia's students. The Commission issued its recommendations, which focused on five areas: safety, accountability (including standards, assessment, public reporting, and accreditation), planning, parental and community involvement, and technology.

The existing Virginia Standards of Learning were revised and adopted by the SBE in June of 1995. The new standards reflect high expectations and academic rigor in the content areas of English, mathematics, science, history, the social sciences, and technology. The newly adopted standards were developed by teams that included practicing educators, among other mem-

bers. The Virginia Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) is overseeing the process of creating a new state assessment system, which will be used to monitor the performance of students in relation to the standards. Passing the new 11th-grade assessment tests will be a diploma requirement for students. Other consequences related to the new testing system, whether at the student or school level, have not yet been determined. Field testing of the new assessments is scheduled for the spring of 1997, with the first operational administration of the tests scheduled in the spring of 1998.

In January of 1996, the legislature called for the establishment of the Virginia Commission on the Future of Public Education. The 21-member Commission is composed of 13 elected officials (representing the state house and senate and the governor's office), the secretary of education, the SBE president, the SEA superintendent, the college chancellor, the higher education council director, and eight citizens. The eight citizens must include a public school teacher, a parent, a school principal, a division superintendent, and a business representative. The Commission is charged with developing a vision for public education that provides strategies for implementing the revised standards, improving teacher preparation and in-service training to assist

students in learning the standards, providing incentives and rewards to schools, enhancing workplace preparation for high school students, using instructional technology, and enhancing community involvement, among other areas. An interim report from the Commission is expected in 1997, and final recommendations will be issued in 1998.

The State Role in Professional Development

Virginia's legislature passed resolution HJR 52 in February of 1996 to acknowledge "the inestimable value of inservice training programs to the professional development of school employees . . . and that the Commonwealth be committed to the continued professional development of persons involved in public education at all levels." Although the state has not issued standards for professional development, the SEA is encouraging local systems to identify needs and to assume leadership in providing direction to the state on professional development issues and activities. According to the consolidated plan for Virginia education, which the SEA submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in December of 1995, the state's education reform initiative addresses five focal areas: safety, accountability, standards, planning, parental and community involve-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

ment, and technology. The plan also states that the success of those reforms require *"that professional development activities conducted and/or supported by the Department should be planned by schools and divisions and reflect their specific needs."* As such, the SEA will employ a regional professional development delivery system, wherein districts and schools are responsible for designing "collaborative professional development plans." Based on these eight regional professional development plans (which will be continually updated through a local decision-making process), the SEA will conduct activities and provide technical assistance. The regional professional development delivery model is being phased in and is expected to be fully operational by the 1998-99 school year.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL), established by the *Code of Virginia*, serves in an advisory capacity to the SBE and submits recommendations on policies regarding the qualification, examination, licensure, and regulation of school personnel; standards for approval of preservice programs; reciprocal approval of preparation programs; and other related matters. Appointed for three-year terms by the SBE, this 19-member group is comprised, by law, of ten active classroom teachers (from both public and private schools), a principal, a local superintendent, a local director of human resources, a school board member, a parent, a university/college representative, a business representative, and a member at large. In 1994, legislation was passed (HB 1056) to replace ABTEL with an autonomous Professional Standards Board, which would have been authorized to set teacher certification policy; however, this measure was vetoed by the governor due to perceived constitutional violations of current Virginia law. The SEA administers all SBE regulations pertaining to the preparation and licensure of school personnel in Virginia through its Office of Teacher Education and Licensure, which also provides administrative support to ABTEL.

Upon completion of all preservice requirements, beginning teachers are issued a Collegiate Professional License. Teachers who have obtained a master's degree are eligible to receive a Postgraduate Professional License. Both licenses may be renewed every five years in accordance with Virginia's Recertification Point System, created in 1990. The point system requires each license holder to accrue a total of 180 points during the five-year license period. There are ten options for earning renewal points: (1) college credit; (2) educational agency staff development programs; (3) attending professional conferences; (4) peer observations; (5) educational travel; (6) publication of an article; (7) publication of a book; (8) mentorship/supervision; (9) pursuit of an educational project; and (10) curriculum development. License holders without a master's degree must earn a minimum of 90 points by taking college coursework in their endorsed content areas. The remaining 90 points may be earned through one or more of the remaining options. The renewal point system was evaluated in 1994-95. Survey responses of 1,000 teachers and 100 central office personnel showed high degrees of satisfaction with the point system among both groups. The typical mode of satisfying recertification requirements is credit for college coursework.

During its 1996 session, the Virginia General Assembly appropriated funds for two new grant programs that support professional development for licensed teachers at the beginning and advanced levels of their careers. State grants are now available to partially support a statewide mentor teacher program. Districts are required to submit an application and provide matching support in order to receive this grant. Participating districts must provide an end-of-year report on their induction activities: the number of mentor teachers trained and compensation received, the number of teachers who received support from mentors, a description of training activities, linkages with universities, evaluation data, and program expenditures. The second incentive grant program was established for teachers who are pursu-

ing National Board Certification. Up to 75 grants of \$1,000 will be awarded to individual teachers to help defray National Board assessment costs.

State-Supported Programs. In addition to its new regional professional development system, the SEA also sponsors statewide in-service training to increase the pool of qualified personnel in critical teacher shortage areas. The SEA recently piloted a field-based endorsement training program for special education teachers and has offered tuition-free coursework for speech pathologists. Grants are made to regional clusters of school divisions to support in-service training for special education personnel. The SEA also offers continuing education courses related to critical information areas. For example, during the 1995-96 year, the SEA conducted institutes on managing students with challenging behaviors. These courses are available to any school personnel who choose to participate.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. The Virginia Quality Education in Sciences and Technology Initiative (V-QUEST) was created in 1991 through a five-year \$9.6-million grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). V-QUEST consists of seven program components: (1) lead teacher development; (2) models for preservice and in-service activities; (3) instructional materials; (4) educational leadership and administrative support; (5) community action; (6) technology; and (7) assessment. Lead teacher development is V-QUEST's primary professional development component. The goal is for every elementary and middle school in the state to have a designated lead teacher; nearly 500 teachers have been trained thus far. Lead teachers in mathematics and science attend two-week summer institutes and serve as facilitators and trainers of other teachers in their buildings during the school year. An NSF evaluation revealed that lead teachers credited this training with causing their increased use of manipulatives in mathematics and "hands-on discovery learning" in science. V-QUEST training for high school teachers is offered through the preservice/in-service component. Profes-

sional development opportunities within this component range from attending a number of one-day workshops, to working with a committee of educators, to writing new course curricula, to conducting research projects with university staff. Over 75 secondary teachers have participated in these activities.

Virginia has not applied for, nor has it received, a Goals 2000 grant.

Public Funds for Professional Development

State Funds. Funds for professional development are included in the state's basic aid allocation to each local school division. In 1995-96, the state's basic aid allocation provided \$219 for professional development per FTE. These funds may be used for any in-service purpose, such as reimbursing teachers for courses completed, conducting workshops, or contracting with institutions of higher education. Virginia's legislature appropriated \$300,000 to support mentor teacher programs and \$150,000 for National Board incentive grants during the 1996-98 biennium.

Federal Funds. Virginia's consolidated state application to the U.S. Department of Education indicates that the SEA will "reserve one percent (1%) or less" of federal grant funds (other than Goals 2000 and Eisenhower monies) for professional development. Of this reserve, 5 percent will be used to conduct regional workshops and institutes on federal programs and other SEA-sponsored professional development. During the 1995-96 school year, Virginia received \$3.9 million in Eisenhower funds.

Local Funds. In order to receive state funds for their mentoring programs, school divisions must provide matching allocations. The state also offers incentive grants to school divisions to ensure that each school has an automated library/media center. School divisions that accept these grants must assure that 5 percent of the grant is used to provide in-service education in technology.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

In-service activities and continuing professional development after a preservice program are primarily the responsibility of individual school divisions, although the SEA supports many local efforts at the request of superintendents. The *Code of Virginia* requires that each local school board provide a program of professional development to assist teachers and principals in meeting licensure renewal requirements, to help them acquire the skills needed to work with gifted students and students with disabilities, and to increase student achievement. Each school division, in its annual special education plan, must describe professional development activities for special education, related services, and general education personnel working with students with disabilities.

The mandated school year calendar consists of 180 instructional days, with an additional ten days specified for professional development and ten for discretionary days. Set-aside days for professional development are supported by a combination of state and local funds.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Advancement on the state salary scale is awarded for the master's degree and for accumulated years of service. Districts generally do not offer tuition reimbursement to teachers.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Virginia Education Association (VEA) allocates \$500,000 yearly for professional development for its 52,000 members. The VEA conducts workshops and conferences on a variety of instructional issues, as well as on other relevant education issues, such as school violence, inclusion, school law,

and instructional strategies for effective teaching in the classroom. The VEA also provides leadership training for its members and publishes a magazine and newspaper during the school year.

Approved teacher education programs are available at 37 institutions of higher education in Virginia. Teacher preparation institutions assist school divisions in providing schoolwide professional development. Other sources of support for teachers' professional development, including collaborative incentives and teacher networks, are frequently used in Virginia.

Contacts/Information Resources

Thomas A. Elliott
Division Chief for Compliance
Virginia Department of Education
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23216-2120
804-371-2522

Jo-Lynn DeMary
Division Chief of Instruction
Virginia Department of Education
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 22316-2120
804-225-3252

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Washington

Number of Teachers: 45,524

Average Years of Experience: 14

Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 38%

Average Salary: \$35,860¹

Education Policy Context

Washington State's public education system is composed of 296 districts and 1,843 schools, serving nearly one million students. Strong local control with high levels of district autonomy are firmly and proudly held traditions. In 1991, then-Governor Booth Gardner initiated, in collaboration with teachers' organizations, a proactive agenda to design a vision for public education policy in the state.

The Governor's Council on Education Reform and Funding (GCERF) was created in May of 1991 to establish educational priorities focusing on performance-based student learning, comprehensive services for children and families, strengthening teacher education and professional development, and promoting site-based decision making. GCERF's recommendations guided the development of the Student Learning Improvement Act (ESHB 1209), passed by the legislature in 1993. This legislation represents the state's most significant education policy initiative, reflecting a concerted effort to improve learning for all students and supporting a shift to performance-based learning. ESHB 1209 appropriated \$75 million during its first biennium—the largest funding commitment ever made by the state for education improvement. A comprehensive reform bill, it created the

following programs: a state-level commission to oversee the development of academic standards and a new assessment system; a school performance reporting system; school-level grants, called Student Learning Improvement Grants (SLIGs), to support local efforts to meet student learning goals; Readiness-to-Learn grants, which support coordinated services for students and families through local consortiums; and the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL) at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to provide technical assistance and promote parental involvement.

The Commission on Student Learning (CSL) was created in 1992 by SSB 5953. ESHB 1209 "fine tuned" the authorization of the CSL, charging the commission with overseeing the process of identifying content standards and developing new student assessment and school accountability systems. The CSL is an 11-member, state-level body whose members are appointed by the governor and the State Board of Education (SBE). CSL is expected to make standards and assessments available to schools by the fall of 1998, with statewide implementation by the year 2000. CSL focused on developing content standards, called Essential Academic Learning requirements, during its first two years and is now concentrating on designing a new assessment system.

The State's Role in Professional Development

In August of 1992, the SBE, in collaboration with the GCERF, formed a Professional Development Group to review existing policies and provide recommendations for the development of a performance-based teacher certification system. In response to the SBE-GCERF findings, the SBE established the Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards (WACPTS) in 1995 to further explore and design standards for the new teacher certification system.

WACPTS relied on various sources—such as teacher focus groups, national meetings, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and research experts—to develop its initial recommendations, issued in January of 1996. If WACPTS standards are adopted by the SBE, they will be field tested from 1997 to 2000 and take effect in 2000. Washington educators believe that the new certification system will provide the framework necessary for state policy makers, local school systems, and higher education institutions to align teacher professional growth with ESHB 1209 goals and for the state to allocate resources to meet this end.

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

Teacher Certification Policies. Under current teacher certification policies, beginning teachers are issued an initial certificate, which is valid for four years. In 1984, the state created the Teacher Assistance Program (TAP), which is a state-funded, one-year program for beginning teachers. District participation in TAP is voluntary. TAP teachers participate in training and peer observations and work with an assigned mentor teacher throughout their first year. TAP resources are also made available to experienced teachers who are in need of additional assistance. The SEA reports that, during the 1994-95 year, 500 teacher-mentor teams (representing more than 50 percent of all districts) participated in TAP. Since the 1995-96 year, districts have had the option of administering TAP resources and activities themselves or contracting these services through their regional Education Service Districts (ESDs).

To advance to a continuing certificate, a teacher must have 180 days of teaching experience (in or out of state), 45 quarter hours of graduate-level (or upper-division) study beyond the bachelor's degree, two endorsements, and a minimum of three credits of coursework in issues related to abuse. The continuing certificate is renewable every five years upon completion of 150 clock hours of continuing education.

WACPTS is developing recommendations for a new second-level certification process. Upon completion of an SBE-approved teacher preparation program, beginning teachers would be issued a five-year Residency Certificate and be required to participate in a collaboratively developed in-service program. After two years of teaching experience and upon meeting performance standards in the areas of effective teaching, professional development, and leadership and submitting a professional growth plan, teachers would be eligible for the Professional Certificate. Professional growth activities would consist of college courses, in-service activities, and independent study that reflect the standards for professional certification. Standards for a third level, the optional Professional Career Certificate, are still under consideration by WACPTS.

While WACPTS was formed specifically to develop recommendations for the new certification system, the Professional Education Advisory Committee (PEAC) has existed for nearly 50 years to serve as the SBE standing committee on overarching matters pertaining to the preparation and certification of school educators. Reconstituted by the SBE in 1995, PEAC now consists of 36 members representing institutions of higher education, professional associations, school administrators, local boards of education, independent schools, the business community, other lay organizations, and SBE members.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA offers professional development through various categorical programs (e.g., special education, Title I, and bilingual education). A significant portion of state-sponsored professional development is coordinated through nine regionally located ESDs, which serve as resource support centers to respond to the professional development and technical assistance needs of teachers and administrators in their regions. Each ESD houses a state-funded Professional Development Center which, by law, is governed by an in-service committee composed of ESD staff, district administrators and teachers, and a college or university representative.

The SEA also houses the Center for the Improvement of Student Learning (CISL), which is responsible for providing advice and technical assistance regarding the state's performance-based education system to parents, educators, and other community members. CISL disseminates information on Washington's education reform efforts and provides best practices research and advice that can be used to develop and implement school improvement plans, school-based decision making, and community involvement. During the 1994-95 school year, CISL contracted with the ESDs for several technical assistance projects. In 1996, the legislature passed HB 2909, "The Reading Bill," which directs the CISL to develop and implement a process for identifying effective reading programs

and to provide teacher training in those practices.

The CSL has contracted with the Riverside Publishing Company to coordinate teacher training activities for the state's new assessment system. This training will be conducted through 15 regional (plus one SEA) Essential Learning and Assessment Training Centers. The Centers are housed within the nine ESDs and in other existing school district alliances. Center staff conduct training sessions for district-level teams which, in turn, provide training to their colleagues at the local site. During the 1995-96 school year, 1,000 educators were trained by regional center teams. Eventually, every district in the state will have a team trained to provide local support for the Essential Learning requirements and new assessment system. Training costs are distributed among the CSL, the districts, and the regional centers.

The CSL Elementary Teacher Institute is a week-long summer institute developed in 1995 to help elementary teachers understand how to use the Essential Learning requirements for planning and instruction. Institute activities are held at each of the nine ESDs, and clock hours are awarded. A trainer-of-trainers model is employed to encourage institute participants to share information with, and teach new skills to, their colleagues. Approximately 500 teachers participated in the summer of 1996 institutes.

The CSL also sponsors an annual capacity-building conference in collaboration with Central Washington University. The conference is designed to increase the awareness and knowledge of the Commission's work and to gather input from educators on the Essential Learning requirements and assessment system. The conference agenda is organized to encourage district team members to take information back to their districts and share it with others. In its third year (spring of 1996), the conference attracted 1,400 participants; approximately one-third were teachers.

The Washington State Technology Plan for K-12 Common Schools was launched during the 1994-95 school year to provide schools with financial and

technical assistance to implement technology-related instruction. Each school received \$20.61 per student, and each ESD was required to establish an educational technology support center. According to an SEA report, 300 classrooms across the state implemented online curriculum projects in 1994-95.

The Paraeducator Training Program provides training for classroom assistants and includes a training component for teachers on how to work with paraprofessionals to enhance classroom instruction. Over 3,000 paraprofessionals and 1,000 teachers (representing 200 districts) received training through this program in 1994-95. The program is implemented through the Professional Development Centers located at the regional ESDs.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. Washington is using a large portion of its Goals 2000 grant (90 percent) to award SLIGs to districts, schools, and institutions of higher education for the purpose of providing "teacher preservice training, staff development, and local reform planning and implementation to help students meet the student learning goals." Goals 2000 subgrants for school improvement have been awarded to 172 districts, impacting an estimated 10,000 teachers.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The Inservice Training Act of 1977 authorized state funding for professional development. Although this legislation was never fully funded, state funds have been appropriated for this purpose every year since 1977. ESHB 1209 includes an appropriation of funds for SLIGs to be distributed to schools. Each school is eligible to receive a SLIG allocation equivalent to \$62.99 per FTE employee. The SLIG allocation in 1995-96 totaled \$30 million; it is estimated that 75 percent of SLIG-funded activities were related to professional development.

State funds generated by teacher certification fees amount to approximately \$500,000 annually. By law, these funds are applied equally to support

preservice programs and in-service activities. The in-service allocation is distributed among the nine ESDs to support their staff development activities. This allocation may be used for ESD-sponsored professional development programs or issued as grants to districts and schools.

The Teacher Assistance Program receives an average annual appropriation of \$1.6 million per year. Districts receive funding based on the number of new teachers. Mentors and beginning teachers receive a stipend. In 1993, the legislature also appropriated \$400,000 to support Collaborative Professional Development School Pilot Projects and \$2.1 million for the Washington State Technology Plan.

In 1994-95 the state also funded the Collaborative Professional Development School Pilot Project to encourage partnerships among institutions of higher education, K-12 schools, and ESDs (see below). Four grants were awarded, ranging from \$37,000 to \$214,000.

Federal Funds. The Technology Plan is funded by a \$3.9-million grant from the U.S. Department of Education. In 1995-96, Washington State received a \$4.1-million Eisenhower Professional Development grant and a \$6.7-million Goals 2000 grant, a portion of which was used to support local professional development initiatives.

Local Funds. Most districts rely on block grants from the state, local district funds, and federal sources to fund their professional development programs.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Since the 1990-91 school year, districts have been authorized to implement a professional growth program as designed by committees of classroom teachers, support personnel, central office administrators, and building administrators. The professional growth plan must be based on needs as identified through personnel reviews and evaluations, parent and student input, district and individual school improvement goals, and needs assess-

ments. Districts may award clock hours for local in-service activities.

The law requires that a minimum of 58 percent of SLIGs be spent at the building level for planning, staff development, and other activities to improve student learning that are consistent with student learning goals. Schools are required to include information in their annual performance report describing SLIG expenditures and the impact of those activities in advancing their overall school improvement plans. An amendatory act to ESHB 1209 requires the SEA to provide annual reports to the legislature concerning the status and use of SLIGs.

In-service days are not mandated by the state. SEA officials report that, in 1994-95 and 1995-96, the SLIGs provided the equivalent of three additional days for each teacher to engage in building-based planning and professional development. Professional development activities reported most frequently by the schools focused on computers and technology (644 schools), integrating the curriculum (566 schools), and student assessment (544 schools).

School districts with annual enrollments greater than 10,000 students tend to have in-house staff development programs that are able to respond to local-level, in-service needs. Most smaller districts rely heavily on ESDs and other district-level consortia groups as their primary source for teacher in-service activities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

The state teacher salary allocation formula is based on years of service, degree held, and credits earned. Washington allows teachers the option of applying clock hours accumulated through other types of professional development toward advancement on the salary scale. Teachers earning ten clock hours in a state-approved training program are eligible for a one-credit step increase.

Teachers generally do not receive reimbursement for tuition costs or other professional development expenses.

Some districts, at their discretion or through collective bargaining agreements, may provide this type of compensation. However, many districts fund job-related professional development and, in cooperation with a college or university, offer a credit option (paid by the teacher) at a reduced tuition rate, since the workshop presenter's fee is paid by the sponsoring school district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Washington Education Association (WEA) sponsors an array of professional development activities for teachers. Through its office of Instruction and Human Relations, WEA utilizes a "peer teaching cadre model" that provides workshops and course offerings developed and presented by practitioners. The focus of WEA training activities is determined by a survey of the needs and interests of its more than 65,000 members. Participants have a choice of receiving college credit or clock hours. Since January of 1995, over 34,000 clock hours have been granted. In addition to courses and seminars offered throughout the school year, WEA also sponsors a series of two-day conferences.

The state-funded Collaborative Professional Development School Pilot Project, initiated during the 1994-95 school year, has resulted in the creation of four school-university partnerships involving 22 districts, three universities, and four ESDs. Washington State University (WSU) is involved in three of these partnerships. The professional development school in the Ritzville School District represents a partnership among the district, ESD 101 (Spokane), and WSU, in which WSU student teachers learn the district's performance-based education model and Ritzville staff participate in ongoing forums on education reform. WSU also partnered with ESD 112 (Vancouver) and three districts (Vancouver, Evergreen, and Kelso) to establish four professional development schools that offer workshops on assessment and conduct research on classroom techniques and student learning. A third

partnership among WSU, ESD 123 (Walla Walla), and 15 school districts created a professional development school that is preparing paraeducators to qualify for certification. The fourth partnership involves Central Washington University, North Central ESD 171 (Wenatchee), Wenatchee Valley College, and three school districts (Chelan, Manson, and Wenatchee). This partnership focuses on minority candidate recruitment and support at the preservice level and assisting current classroom teachers in obtaining master's degrees.

The Washington Alliance for Better Schools was created in 1992 as an affiliate of the National Alliance for Restructuring Education (NARE) and represents a partnership among five school districts and the University of Washington. Since 1995, the Alliance has been involved with the New American School Development Corporation (NASDC). Alliance members pool resources, collaborate on curricula development and instructional strategies, and provide a network for educators to learn about innovative school improvement strategies. The Alliance has created four Teacher Development Centers (TDCs), which are housed at school sites. The TDCs provide 12-week practicums during the school year and summer institutes for teacher teams from Alliance districts. Participants in the Alliance pledge a minimum commitment of \$10 per student for professional development. Funding support for Alliance activities is also generated through grants from NARE, NASDC, The Boeing Company, Apple Computers, Washington State Goals 2000, and SLIG funds.

The University of Washington Extension Office, in collaboration with the CSL, initiated Project REAL in 1995. The project provides technical assistance to district- and school-based staff in planning and implementing the Essential Learning requirements and new assessment system. Fourteen districts participated in the first year of the program, and 12 additional sites were added for 1996-97. Approximately 150 educators participate directly in Project REAL training activities, for which clock hours and university course credit are awarded.

Contacts/Information Resources

Susan Trimmingham
Chair
Washington Advisory Council for Professional Teaching Standards
Bellingham School District
619 15th Street
Bellingham, WA 98225
360-734-4462

Theodore E. Andrews
Director
Professional Education & Certification
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504
360-753-3222

Donna Dunning
Director,
The Learning and Public Policy Center
Washington Education Association
33434 8th Avenue South
Federal Way, WA 98003
206-941-6700

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



West Virginia

Number of Teachers: 21,029
 Average Years of Experience: 16
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 53%
 Average Salary: \$30,549¹

Education Policy Context

West Virginia is a rural state that serves 314,383 students in its public education system. Each of the counties has its own school district. The State Board of Education (SBE) is a constitutional body that appoints the state superintendent of schools and has responsibility for K-12 public education. The SBE also sets professional development policy for educators. However, an autonomous West Virginia Educators' Professional Standards Board (EPSB), established in 1994, also governs "the education profession, including the establishment of standards for entrance into and continued membership in the profession."² The two boards have been working collaboratively to define their respective roles and responsibilities.

The previous Governor established an additional cabinet-level position responsible for moving his initiatives through the legislature. The Governor maintains a close working relationship with the state superintendent of schools; the cabinet officer responsible for education has increasingly focused on issues of higher education.

The state has recently focused on improving technology in its school systems. One program provided computers for every K-6 classroom in the state, and new legislation will provide computers for classrooms in the middle

and high schools. The Jobs Through Education Act builds partnerships between business and education institutions to coordinate education programming to meet the future needs of the work place.

The State Role in Professional Development

West Virginia's 1990 education reform legislation created a comprehensive state policy on professional development for educators. The policy required every school to establish a faculty senate and a school improvement council, which occurred in 1992. School Improvement Councils are responsible for developing and implementing schoolwide professional development plans. School Improvement Councils and Faculty Senates are comprised of teachers, administrators, parents, and other community representatives. This reform legislation also created the Professional Development Center. Legislation in 1994 created the EPSB. The state occasionally requires specific types of professional development activities for teachers, such as HIV education, new textbook orientation, or staff evaluation for administrators.

Teacher Certification Policies. In West Virginia, an initial teacher's license is valid for three years. To renew, teachers must complete six credit hours of either undergraduate or graduate

coursework within the three-year period and obtain three years of teaching experience. New teachers must also complete the Beginning Educator Internship Program, a program developed locally according to state guidelines. The Internship program primarily involves assigning a mentor to work with new teachers for one year.

The Professional Certificate is a five-year license. Teachers must complete six credit hours of approved college coursework to renew the Professional Certificate. College credit courses are offered through the Center for Professional Development and eight Regional Educational Service Agencies (RESAs) for a small fee, or sometimes free of charge. Conferences and research activities do not currently count as professional development for recertification. However, the SBE has presented a proposal that would allow teachers to use professional development activities other than college coursework to meet recertification requirements. For license renewal, teachers also must submit a letter of recommendation from their county superintendent regarding their successful teaching experience. After teachers renew the five-year certificate twice, or obtain a master's degree, they are awarded a Permanent Certificate, which bestows life-time certification.

EPSB establishes standards for entering and for continued membership in the teaching profession. It sets

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

standards for teacher preparation programs in higher education institutions and for the assessment of teachers hoping to enter the profession. The EPSB, under the direction of the SBE, determines regulations for recertification. The EPSB has statutory authority to issue, renew, suspend, and revoke teacher licenses. The EPSB membership is primarily teachers.

State-Supported Programs. When the Legislature passed the state's major education reform package in 1990, the Governor created the Professional Development Center (referred to as "the Center"). Its mission, as stated in statute, is "to study matters relating to the quality of teaching and management in the schools of West Virginia and to promote the implementation of programs and practices to assure the highest quality in such teaching and management."

The Center's Policy Board, which meets quarterly, consists of ten members, including the state superintendent, the secretaries of education and the arts (who are ex-officio members), a member of the SBE, two teachers, and four citizens. The Center has an Executive Director, a full-time staff, and an advisory council, comprised of the Executive Director (who serves as the Chair), higher education representatives, county school superintendents, school principals, and teachers.

The Center serves as a clearinghouse for professional development information in the state, maintaining a large database on topics, presenters, and a calendar of regional and state programs. The 1990 Legislation required the Center to assume the following responsibilities:

- **The Professional Development Project** was initiated to study professional development issues in the state, identifying characteristics of appropriate performance for professional school personnel and coordinating professional education programs for teachers with those characteristics. The Center works with county staff development councils to update the skills of professional educators through in-

service activities and other programs.

- **The Development Training Project** was established to develop training in developmental instruction, with an emphasis on grades K-4.
- **The Professional Personnel Evaluation Project** was formed to establish programs that provide training in evaluation skills for administrative personnel who evaluate teachers. Administrators must attend three-day workshops (hosted by the Center) in order to receive the administrative certificate. The Center provides training to classroom teachers who serve as mentors in the Beginning Educator Internship Program. They provide a two-day training seminar for all new and mentor teachers, and have published a manual for mentors.
- **The Project for Instructional Renewal through Science and Technology** was charged with determining the most effective ways of delivering electronic instruction, and establishing a comprehensive long-range plan to further the cooperation of various state agencies, county boards of education, and RESAs involved in distance learning. They are responsible for encouraging the use of technology for educational purposes. The ultimate goal of this project is to create a statewide technology network that will link institutions of higher education, schools, libraries, and eventually individual homes with software, data bases, and video learning capabilities.
- **The West Virginia Advanced Placement Center** was created to provide statewide coordination for the continued growth of advanced placement programs in the state's high schools. The Advanced Placement Center assists the West Virginia Department of Education, county boards of education, higher education institutions, The College Board, and the West Virginia Advanced

Placement Advisory Council in all matters related to advanced placement in the state, including: coordinating advanced placement teacher training institutes; establishing a cadre of instructors for institutes of advanced placement training; providing follow-up teacher training in advanced placement matters; identifying and obtaining funding for the project; creating and maintaining a newsletter for networking advanced placement teachers; conducting research and evaluating the state's advanced placement program; serving as a clearinghouse for advanced placement materials and correspondence; and certifying individual courses that meet established standards of advanced placement programs.

- **The Task Force on Teacher Preparation** was established to review and identify methods for improving teacher preparation programs. It was charged with delivering a report to the Governor and legislature by December of 1990.

In addition to the EPSB and the Professional Development Center, the state offers professional development through the West Virginia Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA). The SEA houses the Office of Professional Preparation and the Office of Professional Development and Recognition. The Office of Professional Preparation manages the paperwork for the certification and recertification of education personnel, and for reimbursements for teacher professional development costs. The Office of Professional Development and Recognition works with the Center for Professional Development to provide training for mentors and other purposes.

The SEA offers workshops and institutes through its various divisions. Curriculum coordinators provide professional development to teachers throughout the year. The state funds eight RESAs which provide professional development for educators. Each district in the state is served by a RESA.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. West Virginia is a Goals 2000 state; Goals 2000 funding supports "Education First: A Strategic Plan to Achieve Student Success." The comprehensive plan focuses on student achievement, parental involvement, professional development, technology, and career development.

West Virginia receives a National Science Foundation Teacher Enhancement grant and a Healthy Schools grant. The state participates in the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The legislature appropriates funding for professional development in several ways. The Center for Professional Development has received \$2 million or more per year since its inception in 1990. Eighty-five percent of these funds support direct services. In 1995, the Center received an additional \$2 million to establish a Principals Academy. The state's RESA system receives between \$4 and \$6 million per year for its activities, which include professional development. Counties receive formula funding for professional development, an amount estimated to be approximately one percent of the total county budget, and described as "very small."

The state sets aside funding to reimburse teachers for their required professional development courses. Last year, the legislature appropriated \$120,000 for this program. Many teachers do not bother to apply for the reimbursement due to the paperwork involved and because the funds are distributed on a first-come, first-served basis. State funds were reported to be the largest source of funding for professional development in the state.

Federal Funds. West Virginia received \$2,799,259 in Goals 2000 funding in 1996. The bulk of this funding (90 percent) supported local districts initiatives for school improvement, professional development, and preservice education for teachers.

West Virginia receives Eisenhower funding to support professional development. A large proportion of these funds are dispersed to local districts or institutions of higher education for specific teacher education projects. In FY 1995, West Virginia received \$1,973,643 in Eisenhower funds.

Local Funds. The state requires counties to set aside funding for the county staff development councils and for teacher professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

The 1990 education reform legislation required each district to establish a county professional staff development council. These councils include teachers, who are appointed by faculty senates, and the county superintendent, who serves as a non-voting member. They are responsible for proposing staff development programs for their district. The state mandates that one-tenth of one percent of the county's total operating budget (or one-tenth of the county's total professional development budget) be allocated to the county professional development councils.

Each year, the councils create professional development plans for their districts. These plans are not monitored by the state, but the plans are reviewed when school districts undergo the state accreditation process every four years. However, the only requirement they must meet is that schools set aside three days or 18 hours per year for professional development.

Professional development at the local level is offered through a variety of sources: the Center for Professional Development; the RESAs; and institutions of higher education (although they are primarily involved in preservice education).

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

There is no collective bargaining in West Virginia at the state or local level. The West Virginia Education Associa-

tion (WVEA) and the West Virginia American Federation of Teachers (AFT) chapter are advocacy groups that voice the interests of teachers at the state level.

The state pays for the bulk of public education costs, including professional development. The state reimburses teachers for up to 15 hours of college coursework per year. Some districts reimburse teachers for professional development expenses, but the amount and process varies from district to district. Teachers receive salary increment increases for graduate-level coursework. Teachers who serve as mentors in the Beginning Educator Internship Program are paid a \$600 stipend per year.

Teachers must undergo an evaluation process as directed by the 1990 education reform legislation. Evaluations of educators are not linked to recertification, although they are linked to continued employment. New teachers are evaluated twice each year, with three classroom observations taking place before each evaluation. Tenured teachers are evaluated once each year. After teachers are satisfactorily evaluated, they enter a "professional growth and development" cycle, in which they, with the input of the school principal, set goals and design a written plan for meeting these goals. During the second self-assessment phase, teachers determine if they have met their goals. This process is repeated over the course of a teacher's career.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The WVEA provides professional development for educators upon request, and holds conferences throughout the year for its members (although teachers do not receive recertification credit for attending these conferences). The WVEA influences state-level education policy by having representatives serve on various committees and councils. The West Virginia AFT is also involved in professional development. Subject-matter collaboratives in the state

provide some professional development for their members.

Teachers must obtain college credits for recertification. College coursework can be undertaken through the state RESA system and the Center for Professional Development for small fees.

The West Virginia Education Fund offers grants to schools that can be used for professional development. AT&T and Bell Atlantic provide free Internet access and software and training for educators. IBM won the state contract for installing computers in classrooms; as a part of this agreement, they provide training for teachers.

Contacts/Information Resources

Dr. Gail Looney
Director
Center for Professional Development
The People's Building
179 Summer Street, Suite 221
Charleston, WV 25301
304-558-0539

Barbara Brazeau
Assistant Director
Office of Professional Preparation
West Virginia Department of Education
Building 6, Room 337
1900 Kanawha Blvd. East
Charleston, WV 25305-0330
800-982-2378

West Virginia Educators' Professional Standards Board
c/o Ester Lauderman, Chair
Williamstown Elementary
418 Williams Avenue
Williamstown, WV 26187
304-375-7675

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

² Characteristics of Autonomous State Teacher Professional Standards Boards," Connecticut Education Association, 1995.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>



Wisconsin

Number of Teachers: 52,822
Average Years of Experience: 17
Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 38%
Average Salary: \$36,644¹

Education Policy Context

Wisconsin has more than 844,000 students enrolled in the 427 districts of its public school system. An ongoing debate about its education policy-making structure has had implications for reform efforts. In 1995, the governor signed Wisconsin Act 27 into law. The law would have created a new executive office of education, with an appointed secretary as chief, and moved many of the functions of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) to this new office. Although the legislation would have maintained the existing elected position of state superintendent, the superintendent's staff would have been reduced from more than 300 to six. The law would have established an education commission, chaired by the state superintendent, to function as the policy-making body for the new SEA. However, all administrative authority would have been moved to the new secretary of education.

A lawsuit filed by a coalition of education groups challenged Wisconsin Act 27, and the proposal was declared unconstitutional by the state Supreme Court in March of 1996. Therefore, the SEA still operates as the state's primary education policy office. However, because legislators believed that the SEA would no longer function in the

same capacity, its funding has been severely reduced. The SEA is currently being restructured.

In 1993, the state funded a performance-based assessment initiative that was scheduled to be administered in 1996. However, the funding for this initiative was eliminated in 1995. The SEA is seeking reinstatement of the program and encouraging schools to adopt high standards and rigorous assessments for students. The state is working on content standards and school-to-work initiatives, both of which include professional development for educators.

Wisconsin's best known reform initiative is the Milwaukee voucher experiment. In 1990, the legislature created a program that provided vouchers so that poor families in Milwaukee might send their children to private schools. A total of 1,500 students participate in the program. The program is controversial and academics dispute its effectiveness. Efforts to expand the voucher program have been blocked by the state courts.

The Task Force on Teacher Education and Licensing made formal recommendations to the state superintendent on revisions in teacher certification, but no changes have been implemented. New certification regulations are expected to be adopted within three or four years.

The State Role in Professional Development

There is no state plan for professional development in Wisconsin. The state has investigated the improvement of teacher skills in technology and performance-based student assessment. The state is also considering developing a professional development plan closely linked to the state's 1996-97 Education Improvement Agenda. The state Advisory Council for Teacher Education and Certification advises the SEA on licensing and program approval.

Teacher Certification Policies. The initial certificate must be renewed every five years by earning six credits either from a university, from an approved professional field experience, or through equivalent professional education. The SEA requires 180 clock hours of professional activities in areas related to the area of licensure or to a professional competency. There are no special requirements of first-year teachers.

The state is moving toward a performance-based system of teacher licensure and certification. By 2000, the state intends to have in place outcome standards and assessments for teacher preparation. The 1995 report of the Task Force on Teacher Education and Licensure recommended ten standards covering content knowledge and professional knowledge and skills. The Task Force also made recommendations on career-

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

long professional development for educators: moving from the current one-tiered system to one with several levels of licenses, including beginning teacher, professional teacher, and master teacher. Recognition of National Board Certification has also been part of this discussion. No action has been taken on the recommendations to date.

Wisconsin is a member of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium.

State-Supported Programs. Most professional development is planned and delivered locally. When resources are available, however, the SEA provides staff development. The SEA envisions having a larger role in professional development policy when new certification and recertification rules are implemented.

The state operates a network of Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) that provide professional development services to districts. The 12 CESAs are supported primarily by local districts that pay to join a CESA. Many CESA programs are fee-based and some, when supported by federal dollars, are free of charge. CESAs are neither funded nor evaluated by the SEA, although they do have a working relationship with the state. The CESAs are developing a needs assessment rubric to help coordinate staff development services for schools and districts.

Federal- or Foundation-Supported Programs. FY 1995 was the first year Wisconsin received Goals 2000 funding, which was distributed to districts as subgrants for local school improvement efforts, including professional development. Goals 2000 funds also supported six professional development schools in the state.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. There is no line item in the state budget dedicated to professional development. The SEA, when resources are available, provides technical assistance or staff development to districts. These activities are often supported by federal grants as well. The

state may provide some funding for professional development to support new initiatives, but currently no professional development funds are available from the SEA.

Federal Funds. Goals 2000 funding in 1995 was used in part to support professional development activities in schools. In FY 1995, the state received \$4,577,230 in Eisenhower funding.

Local Funds. School districts are not mandated to set aside a certain percentage of their budgets for professional development. Local and federal funds are thought to be the largest sources of funding for professional development.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

One of the 20 educational improvement standards set by the SEA requires districts to prepare a staff development plan. The plans are not currently monitored by the state. Goals 2000 requires districts to have professional development plans to qualify for funds. Districts are expected to establish professional development committees and to seek teacher input for their professional development plans.

There is no mandated minimum number of days for professional development. The Wisconsin school year calendar includes 180 instructional days; any days beyond that requirement may be used for professional development. Additional days are negotiated for locally and vary by district.

The primary providers of professional development at the local level are: district staff, private consultants, CESAs, the Wisconsin Education Association Council, and universities.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Professional development is negotiated at the local level in Wisconsin. Professional development language is not a mandated bargaining topic in local contracts, but many contain such language.

Most teachers receive salary increments based on course credits or continuing education units. Policies on such salary increments and reimbursements for college coursework, travel and conference registration expenses vary from district to district.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The Wisconsin Education Association Council (WEAC) is a significant provider of professional development, offering an annual two-day conference for members, as well as workshops on various topics throughout the year. WEAC performs research and disseminates articles on best practice through its newsletter. WEAC is working with subject-matter organizations and has provided scholarships for its members to participate in these organizations' conferences. WEAC is training a cadre of its members to become adept in certain areas so they can provide professional development and support. WEAC is sponsoring 100 teachers to participate in a week-long training session in performance assessment.

WEAC funds the WEAC Professional Development Academy, which was created in 1992 in response to membership concern about obtaining high-quality, ongoing professional development. The Academy is working on three different projects: development of a database of quality facilitators, presenters, and educators to work with schools and districts; development of a certification program for educational support personnel, which is being developed with the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Association of School Administrators; and a collaborative effort with these groups and the SEA to develop a professional development certificate and a master teacher certificate. The purpose of the professional development certificate would be to help educators develop individual plans that might consist of on-the-job activities, action research, coursework, discussion groups, or any activity that help them to reach state goals. The professional development certificate

could be sought on an individual or group basis. For example, a school might apply for a professional development certificate when a group of teachers outlines a group plan for meeting the goal of developing student assessments. Certain criteria and standards would have to be met in all plans, and those seeking the certificate would be required to work with an advisor, such as a university staff member. It is thought that teachers would apply for the certificate to gain recognition and license renewal credits. WEAC has not bargained for recognition of the certificate, but has been collaborating with the SEA to link college credit equivalency to the certificate. The master teacher certificate would focus on the attainment of high-level skills in classroom technique and leadership. WEAC wants to make the master teacher certificate comparable with National Board Certification.

Subject-matter organizations offer professional development opportunities. One interview respondent said, "There is an organization for every discipline, and they all do professional development. There are hundreds of them." The Wisconsin chapter of the Association of Supervisors for Curriculum Development and the state chapter of the National Staff Development Council also provide professional development to educators.

Higher education institutions are major providers of professional development. In addition to course offerings leading to the renewal of teacher licenses, many colleges and universities maintain partnerships with local school districts to provide professional development. Higher education institutions are involved in many WEAC activities and work with the state on the Teacher Education and Certification Task Force. The University of Wisconsin at Parkside offers direct staff development services through a local teacher center that is funded partially by the University and partially by local districts. Many other institutions of higher education in the state maintain close working relationships with the neighboring districts.

The CRAY Foundation has established corporate partnerships with local districts, providing technical support and teacher training in math and science.

Contacts/Information Resources

Peter Burke
Director
Division of Learning Support and Instructional Services
P.O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707-7841
608-266-0986

Katherine Lind
Consultant
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
125 Webster Street
Madison, WI 53707
608-266-1788

Katie Stout
Director
Division for Instruction and Professional Development
Wisconsin Education Association Council
P.O. Box 8003
33 Nob Hill Drive
Madison, WI 53708
608-276-7711, x215

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>

Wyoming

Number of Teachers: 6,537
 Average Years of Experience: 15
 Percentage Holding Master's Degrees: 27%
 Average Salary: \$30,954¹

Education Policy Context

Wyoming's public education policies reflect a system of strong local control, resulting in wide variability in the areas of school financing, curricula programming, and student assessment across the state's 49 rural district sites.

In 1990, Wyoming's General Assembly passed Enrolled Act 50, calling for the State Board of Education (SBE) to establish statewide goals for public education. The Wyoming Department of Education (referred to hereafter as the state education agency, or SEA) was charged with developing a core curriculum. The SEA collected curriculum materials from every district and contracted the Mid-continent Regional Laboratory (McREL) to develop core curriculum standards. Statewide committees in each of the core curriculum areas reviewed McREL's work, identified model exit standards, and made final recommendations to the SBE.

In June of 1995, the SBE adopted core curriculum standards and achievement goals for science, mathematics, fine arts, applied technology, and language arts. Statewide committees (with the assistance of McREL) are presently developing an accountability system based on the core curriculum goals. The new accountability system is expected to take effect in the 1996-97 school year.

Enrolled Act 50 required local districts and their communities to establish performance standards for student learning. A new school accreditation process that measures schools' progress is being phased in and will be fully operational by the 1996-97 school year. Enrolled Act 50 also mandates districts to issue an annual report card to the community and the SBE. The report cards, first issued in September of 1992, contain the district's annual high school dropout rate, averages of student assessment results, the number of classroom instruction hours by grade level, the number of parent and community participants and programs, the number of parental visits, the number of students involved in extra-curricular activities, an itemization of school budget expenditures (by percent), the district's goals, and a description of the district's school improvement efforts.

Throughout much of this process, Wyoming's school finance system has been the target of a lawsuit initiated in July of 1992 by four of the state's largest schools districts (Campbell 1, Sweetwater 1 and 2, and Uinta 1), which were later joined by the Wyoming Education Association. The suit focuses on school equity and charges that the current system is unconstitutional. In November of 1995, the Wyoming Supreme Court ordered the legislature to identify by July of 1997 the components of a

"quality education" and provide funds to ensure that all districts achieve that standard. The ruling exceeds the school finance issue by reinforcing the state's role in determining and assuming leadership over the elements of public education. The SEA and SBE issued a joint press release in response to the court's ruling, indicating that Enrolled Act 50 activities will remain in effect and be used by the legislature in their efforts to "craft a quality education program for Wyoming schools."

The State Role in Professional Development

Wyoming's SEA and SBE are in the process of drafting *Strategic Plan 2000*, an education improvement plan that identifies staff development as one of six priority areas. The plan proposes to create a statewide staff development plan that would provide financial incentives for district- and school-based professional development activities and include a state monitoring system to evaluate the quality of local programs. Timelines for the development and implementation of the objectives as outlined in the strategic plan are yet to be established.

Teacher Certification Policies. The Wyoming Professional Teaching Standards Board (PTSB) is a statutory, autonomous entity created by the

This profile is a product of a 50-state study of teacher professional development conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. The study and resulting publications were supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Additional support has been provided by the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This profile was reviewed by the state education agency in the summer and fall of 1996. Any errors of fact or opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the authors.

legislature in 1992. The PTSB has authority over licensing teachers and establishing certification rules and regulations. The PTSB also approves local staff development programs for continuing education unit (CEU) credit. The 13-member PTSB consists of six classroom teachers, two school principals, one auxiliary staff representative, one central office administrator, one local school board member, and two representatives from higher education institutions.

Upon completion of all preservice requirements, Wyoming teachers are issued a standard certificate that is renewable every five years with the completion of five semester hours of college coursework or CEU credit. CEU credits may be earned by participating in PTSB-approved, in-service activities offered by local districts and other providers. Teachers who achieve National Board Certification are considered to have met their renewal requirement for one five-year cycle. There is no special program offered for beginning teachers.

State-Supported Programs. The SEA does not have an office to oversee state-sponsored professional development activities. Most of the training activities conducted in the state are linked to categorical programs (e.g., special education and Title I). One statewide training effort for all school personnel is provided by the School Accreditation Office, which is conducting statewide training on the new school accreditation process. In addition, the SEA is currently training staff from districts that were not included in the accreditation training held during the 1995-96 school year. This cadre of trainers will be used as accreditation monitors for on-site accreditation teams in 1996-97 and 1997-98.

Federal or Foundation-Supported Programs. Wyoming uses a number of federal and foundation resources to support staff development activities at the local level. Sources include Eisenhower grants and the National Diffusion Network, as well as Title I and Chapter 2 funds.

Public Funding for Professional Development

State Funds. The Wyoming legislature does not appropriate funds specifically for professional development at the state or local level. Consequently, funding support for in-service activities is dependent on federal sources and districts' discretionary use of general funds.

Federal Funds. Wyoming received a \$1.2-million Eisenhower Professional Development Grant for the 1995-96 school year.

Local Funds. Local budget set-asides for professional development are not required. Expenditures in this regard vary considerably among districts.

Impact of State Policies on Local Professional Development

Wyoming's school accreditation process requires each school and district to have a staff development plan that is based on district and school student performance goals. Staff development activities must be based on needs as identified through student assessments; specifically, staff development must focus on subject-matter areas in which student performance is poor.

The 180-day school year calendar includes five non-instructional days that may be used for staff development and/or housekeeping activities. Districts also have the option of using an alternative school day schedule to create more time or days for in-service activities. One SEA official estimated that only a handful of districts (six or seven) utilize this option.

Districts acquire much of their in-service activities by contracting with out-of-state experts and staff from regional labs. Districts also contract professional development services from other districts. The SEA and institutions of higher education are not considered to be a primary source of professional development at the local level.

Teacher Compensation for Professional Development

Teacher compensation policies for professional development are determined through local collective bargaining agreements. There is a great deal of variability among districts in this regard. The state salary schedule awards step increases based on a teacher's number of years in service. Professional growth activities, such as advanced degrees or the accumulation of graduate credits, are not merited on the salary schedule.

Other Professional Development Opportunities

The University of Wyoming (UW) is the only four-year postsecondary institution in the state. The Wyoming School-University Partnership promotes collaborative programming between school and university staff in the areas of teacher education, instructional technology, staff development, and school restructuring. The Partnership was created in 1987 to restructure the teacher preparation program to provide its students with an in-depth, school-based training experience beginning in their second year. In 1994, a Staff Development Task Force was created to provide a clearinghouse on research, resources, and best practices in staff development; to identify and support networking opportunities; to enhance the awareness level of staff development events; to facilitate critical conversations on staff development issues; and to advocate for effective staff development. The Task Force members include UW faculty and deans, the PTSB director, an SEA official, and superintendents representing the 16 partnership districts. An Eisenhower grant (totaling \$27,000 for the 1995-96 year) has provided funding for the Task Force to establish a Staff Development Academy and conduct a district-level, in-service needs assessment.

The A-Trac Center for Teacher Development, developed by the Natrona County School District, is utilized as a major professional development provider at the state and local levels. Since 1991, A-Trac staff have provided training activities in response to district requests and state reforms; it also publishes a bimonthly *Learning Services* newsletter that lists upcoming professional development activities throughout the state. A-Trac has been instrumental in promoting the use of writing assessment at the district level. Records indicate that every district in the state has utilized its services and that the SEA has contracted with them as well. Each year, A-Trac sponsors a three-day, statewide conference on teaching pedagogy. Funding for A-Trac activities is secured through Chapter 2 funds for two full-time staff and fees charged to other districts for services provided.

Contacts/Information Resources

Linda Stowers
Director
Professional Teaching Standards Board
Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor
2300 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-7291

Jan Sheinker
Director
School Accreditation Unit
Wyoming Department of Education
Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor
2300 Capitol Avenue
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-6808

Peter Ellsworth
Coordinator
Staff Development Task Force
Wyoming School-University Partnership
P.O. Box 3992
Laramie, WY 82071
307-766-6671

¹ Sources: National Resource Data Center and National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Figures are for 1993.

Ordering Information

Copies of other state teacher professional development profiles are available through the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Copies of the complete 50-state report are also available. Please call 215-573-0700, x0 for further information.

Copies of the teacher professional development profiles are available on CPRE's home page at:

<http://www.upenn.edu/gse/cpre/>